THE UNIVERSITY OF ALBERTA

RELEASE FORM

NAME OF AUTHOR Mary Ellen Gillan
TITLE OF THESIS Female Prisoners and the Inmate Code

DEGREE FOR WHICH THESIS WAS PRESENTED Master of Arts
YEAR THIS DEGREE GRANTED 1976

Permission is hereby granted to THE UNIVERSITY OF ALBERTA LIBRARY to reproduce single copies of this thesis and to lend or sell such copies for private, scholarly or scientific research purposes only.

The author reserves other publication rights, and neither the thesis nor extensive extracts from it may be printed or otherwise reproduced without the author's written permission.

THE UNIVERSITY OF ALBERTA

FEMALE PRISONERS AND THE INMATE CODE

by

MARY ELLEN GILLAN

A THESIS

SUBMITTED TO THE FACULTY OF GRADUATE STUDIES AND RESEARCH

IN PARTIAL FULFILLMENT OF THE REQUIREMENTS FOR THE DEGREE

OF MASTER OF ARTS

DEPARTMENT OF SOCIOLOGY

EDMONTON, ALBERTA

SPRING, 1976

THE UNIVERSITY OF ALBERTA

FACULTY OF GRADUATE STUDIES AND RESEARCH

The undersigned certify that they have read, and recommend to the Faculty of Graduate Studies and Research, for acceptance, a thesis entitled "Female Prisoners and the Inmate Code" submitted by MaryEllen Gillan in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of Master of Arts.

ABSTRACT

This thesis examines the relation between background variables (race, age, residence, education, prior imprisonment, type of offense) and situational variables (institutional career phase, relations with staff, community contact) as they affect inmates' expressed code commitment. The dependent variable, code adherence, measures the extent to which inmates express commitment to the informal inmate subculture.

The main differences between this study and previous work in the area are: exploration of both situational and imported models, Canadian based research, and a study of female inmates.

Data was collected from inmate populations of three western correctional centres. The number included in this study is 117 of which 38% are natives (Indians and Metis). The mean age is 25; 60% of the participants are from urban areas; 74% have less than high school graduation; 31% have no prior prison record and 50% are serving sentences of 11 months or less.

The findings of this study indicate support for both imported and situational models. The major findings related to the situational variables suggest that institutional career phase affects the extent to which inmates express code commitment but this relationship is very tenuous. The phase variable is probably inappropriate for the inmate population and types of institutions included in this study. Community contact does not appear to affect code adherence but this variable needs further examination.

A relationship between dependence on staff and code commitment exists: those who indicate strong code commitment also express low dependence on staff.

The major findings related to the imported variables are: a relationship between code adherence and race exists: natives express lower code commitment than white inmates; a negative relationship exists between age and code adherence; no relationship exists between education and code commitment; no relationship exists between urban residence and code adherence; and inmates with prior prison experience indicate high code commitment.

This thesis is one of the first studies of imprisoned females in Canada. It is suggested that more research focus on incarcerated females and that special consideration be given to the imprisoned native offender.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I wish to acknowledge the support and suggestions offered by my committee members, Drs. Hartnagel, Hobart and Earp. My supervisor, Dr. T.F. Hartnagel, was extremely helpful and understanding.

The Departments of Corrections of the provinces of British Columbia and Alberta were supportive of this project as were the female inmates who participated in this study. The Alberta Department of Corrections provided financial assistance which alleviated the costs incurred in the thesis.

W.A. Avison and J.R. Tanner contributed to the statistical acumen in the early stages of the thesis and D. Skoog provided additional support in this area during the final stages -- I am grateful for their assistance and support.

For their indefatigable encouragement I wish to thank D.A. Nock and L. Cormier. Support in this endeavour was also offered by T.A. Edwards, D. Heckbert, D.J. Demers, R. Sydie, A. Galet and B. Robinson.

A special note of thanks is due to the members of the Gillan family who were not infrequently active participants in the project.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

PAGE

LIST OF TABLES

Table Description Page

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

The intention of this thesis is to explore the extent to which incarcerated females assimilate the informal inmate subculture or code. An inmate code is comprised of the norms, values and rules which are shared in common by the inmate members of the informal institutional social system.

The research will focus on the degree of acceptance of the norms of the inmate subculture by individual inmates, as such acceptance is affected by such background variables as age, education, offense and previous imprisonment as well as the situational variables of institutional career phase, relations with staff and community contact. This thesis is primarily a replication of the study done by G.F. Jensen (1974) on 172 female inmates imprisoned in the United States.

Clemmer (1958) originated the term prisonization to refer to "the taking on in greater or less degree of the folkways, mores, customs and general culture of the penitentiary." Jensen notes that the concept of prisonization originally referred to

> the "taking on" or assimilation of an inmate code over the time in the institution. However, the concept is also widely used to refer to the degree to which an inmate embraces certain attitudes towards the institution, its staff and other inmates <u>regardless of the source</u> of that variation. For example in summarizing his earlier research, Wheeler (1971:1006) states that "An attitude measure of attitudinal conformity versus non-conformity to the values of the staff...was developed to serve as an empirical indicator reflecting Clemmer's concept of prisonization." However, in the strictest sense prisonization does not refer to a set of attitudes but <u>the taking on of a</u>

> set of attitudes as a result of the prison experience. The present study examines correlates of attitudinal conformity to the values of the staff but treats "prisonization" as an hypothesis central to functional theories rather than as a dependent variable. The existence of certain relationships between inmate attitudes and situational variables is indicative of prisonization-not the attitudes themselves.
>
> (1974:20)

McCorkle and Korn extrapolate from the concept of prisonization in describing the inmate subculture "as providing a way of life which enables the inmate to avoid the devastating psychological effects of internalizing and converting social rejection into self-rejection." (1970:409) This is also referred to by Sykes and Messinger:

> By creating an ideal of endurance in the face of harsh social conditions, then, the society of prisoners opens a path to the restoration of self-respect and a sense of independence that can exist despite prior criminality, present subjugation, and the free community's denial of the offender's moral worthiness.
>
> (1960:17)

The two main explanations of the origin and maintenance of the inmate subculture and code are the situational and importation models.[1] The situational explanation views the development of an inmate code as a reaction to the prison experience:adherence to the code enables the inmates to endure the harsh aspects of imprisonment. It is this model which is referred to by Clemmer, McCorkle and Korn and Sykes and Messinger. Thomas and Foster, in criticizing the situational model, state that "the closed-system paradigm characteristic of the deprivation model is inadequate for explanations of either prisonization or the consequences of that process." (1971:229) This view is supported by Ward and Kassebaum

---

[1] These explanations are also referred to as the functional-indigenous origin model and the diffusion model.

(1965:56). The importation explanation emphasizes the background characteristics of the individual inmates: the explanation argues that pre-prison behavior affects the extent to which the inmates will adhere to the norms of the inmate subculture. Most previous research focuses upon one or the other of these two perspectives. This thesis attempts to examine aspects of both situational and imported characteristics as they affect inmate norms.

With few exceptions (Giallombardo, 1966; 1974; Jensen, 1974; Heffernan, 1972; Ward and Kassebaum, 1965), prisonization research is confined to the study of male inmates. Giallombardo, Heffernan, and Ward and Kassebaum concentrate on organizational and homosexual facets of women in prison. The possibility of different reactions to imprisonment by females and males is suggested by the Canadian Committee on Corrections (1969): "In women's institutions there is a stronger factor of 'emotional contagion,' through the more readily expressed emotionality of women, than with a comparable group of men." Some support for this suggestion comes from Tittle's study (1969) on female narcotic addicts as well as studies by Giallombardo and Ward and Kassebaum.

These suggestions plus the lack of literature and research in this area shows the need for further study particularly as it applies to female inmates. Obviously policy planning for both female and male inmates is based on research of male inmate populations. This problem is even more acute for incarcerated Canadian females. A Canadian study provides information in this neglected area and permits comparison with American research.

CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

In The Society of Captives (1965), Sykes outlines the pains of imprisonment in terms of deprivation of liberty, goods and services, heterosexual relationships, autonomy, and security. He focuses on the psychological effect on the inmate's self-concept which results from these deprivations. Adherence to an inmate code is viewed as an adaptation to imprisonment which reduces harmful effects on the individual for "if the rigors of confinement cannot be completely removed, they can at least be mitigated by the patterns of social interaction established among the inmates themselves." (1965:82)

The method employed for Sykes' study includes interviews with inmates, questionnaires concerning the behavior of inmates in terms of relationships with other inmates and with guards. He also includes personal observations of inmate interactions. His study focuses on the existence of an informal social system as a reaction to the deprivations of imprisonment. He indicates that

> the patterns of social interaction among the inmates are found to be scattered between...two theoretical extremes. The population of prisoners does not exhibit a perfect solidarity yet neither is the population of prisoners a warring aggregate. Rather, it is a mixture of both and the society of captives lies balanced in an uneasy compromise.
>
> (1965:83)

Cloward refers to the origin of the inmate social system in the

following terms: "...deviance arises in the prison largely in response to discrepancies between aspirations for rehabilitation and expectations of achievement." (1960:32) The disparity between goals and means is viewed as the basis for an inmate social system. Adherence to this system is considered an adaptation to the prison environment. Cloward informs us that "patterns of accommodation generate deviant opportunity structures in which prisoners compete for material wealth, power, or status." (1960: 36) Thus it can be seen that he concentrates on the situational influences of imprisonment. The structural accommodations of the inmate system refer to the roles of "merchant" or "peddler" (material accommodation); the "fixer" or "politician" (power accommodation); and the "real man" or "right guy" (status accommodation).

Wheeler's work (1961) concentrates on the situational variable of sentence length or inmate career phase. He indicates that Clemmer's prisonization theory assumes a linear relation between prisonization and length of sentence. Wheeler's study is concerned with the possibility that changes in attitudes toward the inmate subculture are related to the length of sentence. Wheeler postulates that inmate attitudes at the beginning and end of the sentence are similar to the legitimate or conventional attitudes of the community outside the prison. He reports a 'U-shaped curve' of conformity to the attitudes of the outside community (i.e. conventional law-abiding values) when inmates are categorized in terms of length of sentence yet to be served. This finding is summarized by Wheeler who suggests two processes which may be in operation to account for the U-shaped distribution of high conformity responses.

> A progressive opposition to staff norms is observed when inmates are classified whether by length of time served or by institutional career phase. The second process appears to be one of differential attachment to the values of the broader society. The U-shaped

> distribution of high-conformity responses suggests that inmates who recently have been in the broader community and inmates who are soon to return to that community are more frequently oriented in terms of conventional values. Inmates conform least to conventional standards during the middle phase of their institutional career. These inmates appear to shed the prison culture before they leave it, such that there are almost as many conforming inmates at time of release as at time of entrance into the system.
>
> (1961:706)

It is significant that Wheeler notes "another influence is the degree of attachment to families and friends outside the institution, a factor noted by Clemmer but one which the present research does not adequately measure." (1961:705) The references to the outside influences of the family and community are similar to Schrag's (1961) observations. What we see here is a weakness in the prisonization research. This lack of attention to imported characteristics is recognized by some authors and is a major concern for the present thesis.

Atchley and McCabe (1968) report a study of staff-inmate relations which finds no support for either Wheeler's or Clemmer's earlier work regarding the influence of time on the inmate's adherence to the inmate subculture. They point out that "the relationship between time spent in the institution or phase of institutional career and prisonization is mediated by some unknown third variable." (1968:776) This study does not consider pre-institutional inmate characteristics although the authors recognize the importance of "other factors which could have been translated into differences in response to imprisonment." (1968:781)

In <u>The Social World of Imprisoned Girls</u> (1974), Giallombardo discusses the function of the inmate subculture among female delinquents:

> While the prisoner cannot completely eliminate the deprivations of imprisonment, a cohesive system with group allegiance as its dominant value can provide a reference group through which the inmate

> can reinstate his (sic)[2] self-image or in some sense neutralize the effects of its loss. This conclusion was derived from case studies of single institutions.
>
> (1974:2)

Giallombardo also suggests that differential responses to imprisonment by sex may be "influenced by the differential participation of males and females in the external culture." (1974:3) This view is also expressed more generally by Thomas and Foster (1971): "the quality of the adaptive normative system which evolves in response to various pressures and problems of imprisonment has its origin in the pre-prison experiences and socialization of the inmates." (1971:231) Again we note the suggestion that both situational and imported characteristics affect the degree of commitment to the inmate code.

Thomas and Foster report in "Prisonization in the Inmate Contraculture" (1971) that prisonization "in the context of a maximum security institution has negative consequences for...the long-term life chances of the inmate." (1971:339) Their study, based on male felons, includes a test of the relationship between prisonization and future expectations. They also examine the effects of prisonization as it is related to efforts at rehabilitation within the prison. They suggest that

> as the inmates become more and more responsive to the normative demands of the contraculture, and as they move into antisocial roles within the structure of inmate society, the probability of imprisonment having negative consequences for both the change-oriented goals of the prison and the long-term life-chances of the inmates increases considerably.
>
> (1971:237)

---

[2] In general, masculine terms are used when researchers report on studies whether or not the studies include both sexes or only females.

They indicate that "the impact of prisonization is mediated by factors external to the prison" (1971:231) but they are referring to community contacts as well as post release expectations. They view the situational and importation models as complementary. A finding relevant to the present research is that "the greater the degree of normative assimilation, the greater the negative effects of imprisonment" (Thomas and Foster, 1971: 235) The term "normative assimilation" refers to the extent the inmates adhere to the inmate code; the extent to which inmates express code commitment or assimilate the norms of the inmate subculture.

The Vanier Centre for Women in Ontario has a research project presently in progress. The first report, An Examination of the Social Milieu (1974) reports an examination of "the perceptions the respondents had of the total complex and specific living units...programs, and individual experiences they encountered." (1974:1) The finding of concern here is that there is

> little evidence to lead to any generalizations about negative inmate solidarity at Vanier. This supports results found in recent studies of other institutional environments which show that active treatment programs involving communication, program change, etc., can foster more congruence between staff and residents on specific areas of concern.

The social climate of the institution, then, can be viewed as having a potentially significant effect on the prison experience.

Support for the importation model includes work by Schrag (1961) who identifies several inmate types or patterns of inmate adaptation to the prison. Patterns of inmate adaptation are related to the pre-institutional career of the inmates: their criminal records, family and community experiences and attitudes towards crime and society. These imported characteristics are regarded by Schrag as determinants of the inmate's social type within the prison. The extent of adherence to the

inmate code is viewed by Schrag as varying with inmate type: the prosocial type has both a high knowledge of and affective support for legitimate norms; the antisocial type exhibits both a high knowledge of and affective attachment for illegitimate norms; the pseudosocial type has a high knowledge of both the legitimate and illegitimate norms but little affective support for either; the asocial type expressed limited knowledge of and/or affective rejection of both the illegitimate and legitimate norms. Interaction patterns of the social types reveal: the prosocials have high staff-low inmate contacts; the antisocials have low staff-high inmate contacts; the pseudosocials have high staff-high inmate contacts and the asocial types have low staff-low inmate contact patterns.

Schrag's methodology includes questionnaire items measuring both situational and imported characteristics:

> various dimensions of self-conception are shown to vary according to the inmate's duration of confinement, his pre-institutional criminal record, (and) his normative orientation. Included among the self-concept dimensions that show the above relationships are the inmate's perception of his degree of sophistication regarding criminal activities, and the amount of support he perceives as coming from persons in the civilian environment.
>
> (1961:355)

Schrag obtained indirect evidence of inmate participation patterns by questioning inmates about their contact with other inmates and staff. He reports high staff-low inmate participation for prosocial inmates. This high frequency of contact is not reported for any of the other inmate types. The pseudosocial type exhibits a high staff-high inmate participation pattern; the antisocial has low staff-high inmate and the asocial indicates low staff-low inmate participation patterns. (Schrag, 1961:353)

When considering the effects of pre-institutional vs situational

influences on the inmate's prison experience, Schrag states that

> among the more important balancing mechanisms are factors in the pre-institutional careers of the inmates, their normative orientations, and their patterns of social participation within the prison community.
>
> (1961:356)

Irwin and Cressey (1962) also suggest that adherence to an inmate culture is related to the categories of inmates: "those oriented to a criminal subculture, those oriented to a prison subculture and those oriented to a 'conventional' or 'legitimate' subculture." (1962:145) They maintain that inmate conduct cannot be understood by viewing the prison social system separately from the orientations of the participants. They indicate that situational or indigenous origin explorations have been over emphasized and they focus upon the inmates' orientation to criminal or legitimate social systems; these orientations are determined by previous criminal involvement and degree of criminal sophistication.

Irwin and Cressey contend that

> the 'functional' or 'indigenous origin' notion has been overemphasized and that observers have overlooked the dramatic effect that external behavior patterns have on the conduct of inmates in any given prison.
>
> (1962:145)

Ward and Kassebaum in Women's Prison, Sex and Social Structure (1965) express agreement with Giallombardo regarding the influence on inmate culture from the external culture: "some of the problems of adjustment faced by inmates may be countered with a normative position brought from the free world." (1965:57) They conclude, as does Giallombardo, that reactions to imprisonment will be significantly different for females. Jensen notes that Ward and Kassebaum found "no evidence of a U-shaped relation nor any significant relations involving time served or remaining." (1974:8)

Esther Heffernan in Making It in Prison (1972) indicates the existence of "an inmate social system that functions to solve the focal issues of imprisonment...that enable the inmate system to act cohesively and to reject the rejectors." (1972:16) Her report is based on female inmates incarcerated in an institution providing a mixture of minimum, medium and maximum security classifications. This is similar to the institutions included in the present thesis. Although her primary instrument for obtaining information is a structured interview, she also reports on file information.

In her analysis, Heffernan indicates that "the degree of adherence to a code outside prison as well as inside is dependent on the level of identification with the peer group involved." (1972:127) She further states that "differential acceptance and perception by system type can be expected." (1972:129) The system types are: the square, the cool, and the life. (1972:203)

Heffernan's methodology involves an initial categorization of inmates as non-criminal, professional or habitual. This is similar to the descriptions used by Irwin and Cressey (1962). With these classifications Heffernan views the subsystems of the inmate adaptive system. Her basic hypothesis is

> that there is no single inmate adaptive system, but rather that it is composed of multiple subsystems with goals, codes of acceptable behavior, and means of mutual support that reflect their members' reactions to imprisonment and perceptions of what 'the good life' (or perhaps just survival on one's own terms) might possibly be in prison.
>
> (1972:25)

Heffernan's three offense types - non-criminal, professional or habitual - are used "to distinguish differing normative backgrounds and institutional experiences." (1972:32).

While Heffernan posited multiple subsystems of the inmate adaptive system as they are related to inmate offense types, the present research is suggesting that there is differential commitment to an inmate code and that this commitment is related to such variables as background characteristics and situational influences. The difference, then, is that while Heffernan views background influences as conducive to the development of subsystems of the inmate system, this thesis proposes that differences in imported and situational variables affects the extent of commitment to an inmate code.

Like Ward and Kassebaum, Heffernan finds no relation between institutional career phase and commitment to the inmate code. What she does find is that over 50% of the inmate types identified as "the square" (noncriminal) "assert some allegiance to the code" whereas 69% of "the cool" (professional) accept the code; 60% of "the life" (habitual) accept the code; and 55% of the "total population actually assert their complete adherence to the code." (1972:129).

In "Prisonization or Resocialization? A Study of External Factors Associated with the Impact of Imprisonment" (1973), Thomas reports on preprison experiences as well as situational aspects of imprisonment. The latter includes detailed examination of contact with the outside community which Thomas indicates is an aspect of imprisonment which has a strong effect on the degree of prisonization. Preprison experiences, he suggests, predisposes persons so that there is a "prisonization potential" for each inmate (1973:19). As suggested in this thesis, Thomas states that "the influence of the immediate prison situation can provide only a partial explanation of the impact of imprisonment." (1973:20) Rather than examine career phases as influences on prisonization Thomas

is interested in post-prison expectations of the inmates. His central concern, however, is "that numerous contingencies...affect the degree of prisonization... ." (1973:15) He considers pre-prison experiences as well as the "quality and quantity of...contacts with the larger society during...imprisonment." (1973:15) He concludes that "the greater the degree of contact with the outside, the lower the degree of prisonization." (1973:20)

Garabedian (1963) in "Social Roles and Processes of Socialization in the Prison Community," reports findings consistent with those of Clemmer and Wheeler. The focus of Garabedian's study, although he considers career phase, is primarily on different inmate role types as they are affected by length of imprisonment: "the point of heaviest impact varies with the different role types." (1963:151) This is another study conducted in a maximum security prison for male felons where the number of inmates incarcerated for long sentences is considerably greater than the population of the present thesis. Garabedian dichotomizes code adherence into high and low with scores based on answers to five items reflecting conformity to staff norms. The major difference between Garabedian's study and the present thesis, other than sex, is illustrated by Garabedian's conclusion that "data...suggest that the point of heaviest impact (of the effects of imprisonment) varies with the different role types... ." (1963:151) In the present research the point of heaviest impact is not related to any specific role type but rather to expressed code adherence.

Tittle and Tittle (1964) report on a study of voluntary and involuntary narcotic addicts in "Social Organization of Prisoners: An Empirical Test." They recognize the existence of a prison code as an

"institutional product of expressive norms of a prisoner social organization, which serves to help inmates overcome the deprivations of prison living." (1964:216) Findings of relevance to the present thesis include: an effect on code adherence for those with previous jail experience (they scored higher on code commitment); and a lesser effect on code adherence among inmates who maintain outside community contact.

Tittle (1969) examines "differences in inmate organizational structures...in an institution where men and women are incarcerated under similar conditions." (1969:503) A significant difference between Tittle's study and the present thesis is that some of the inmates included in his study are voluntarily confined for drug treatment. Tittle points out:

> in the light of the comparative freedom experienced by the inmates at this institution, it is important to consider whether this research provides data relevant to theories developed in ordinary prison contexts.
>
> (1969:493)

Tittle's finding of "small but consistent differences...by sex" (1969:503) further illustrates the need for research on incarcerated females. Also of relevance for the present thesis is his conclusion "that inmate organization is largely a response to institutional conditions." (1969:503)

In "Pre-Institutional vs Situational Influence in a Correctional Community," Schwartz (1971) reports on "competing modes of analysis." He refers to "two theories of inmate organization and change: the "indigenous influence theory" and what might be called the "cultural drift theory." (1971:532) These are comparable to the situational and imported models used in this thesis. Schwartz' situational variables are integration into prison primary groups; staff orientation; family

contact and length of confinement. The last three variables are similar to those employed in this thesis. His dependent variables are: conformity to the inmate code, peer identification, and criminal value orientation. Schwartz considers his dependent variables to be measures of inmate perspectives. He finds that criminal value orientation[3] and conformity to the inmate code are similar in that they both correlate negatively and in about equal measure with an inmate's staff orientation. (1971:536) Also of relevance to this thesis is the finding that inmate code is the only dependent variable Schwartz finds related to length of confinement. He concludes that the "cultural drift theory is...least appropriate for...conformity to the inmate code." (1971:540) But he also reports that "the indigenous influence theory is most valid in respect of an inmate's conformity to the inmate code." (1971:540) The latter finding is explained by Schwartz as follows:

> Inmate perspectives which are most visible to others are probably most likely to be affected by group expectations. Although groups cannot easily monitor members' value-orientations and sense of identification, their conformity to norms against squealing, against refusal to render assistance to peers and the like is quite visible and therefore subject to control. The inmate's value-orientation and self-conception are more likely to be his own rather than the group's business and are therefore less affected by his relations with the group. This reasoning might help explain why conformity to the inmate code alone correlates with length of confinement.
>
> (1971:541)

In general, Schwartz indicates support for a convergence of the situational and imported theories" "the cultural drift and indigenous influence

---

[3] Schwartz developed a criminal value-orientation scale "consisting of fourteen items which tapped admiration of criminal exploits, cynicism regarding the real honesty of the allegedly respectable, acceptance of certain mitigating circumstances excusing criminality, effect of criminality on self-respect and the like." (1971:534)

theories are wrong when each is stated in a form which denies the other ....Because the inmate's perspectives cannot be fully explained without reference to his past we must reject those theories which divorce him from it." (1971:542)

Jensen's study, "Perspectives on Inmate Culture: A Study of Women in Prison" (1974, 1975) is the most recent research in this area. His work compares the effects of imprisonment on females with previous studies done on males. He focuses on three main issues: the relation of traditional "situational" variables (career phase and group contact) to inmate perspectives; the relative impact of situational versus "imported" characteristics on inmate perspectives; and the relevance of labeling theory notions of retributive justice to prisonization research. This latter area is not being explored in the present thesis. Jensen's sample includes female felons and misdemeanants thereby providing variability in sentence lengths similar to that available for the present research.

Jensen's major findings concerning the traditional situational variables, although in the same direction as those of previous research on males, were not statistically significant. He finds the "middle phase inmates are more likely to embrace views contrary to official expectations than inmates in the early or late phases of their institutional careers...(however)...the relationship is not particularly impressive. (1974:8) In addition, Jensen reports that "contact with friends and relatives, relationships with the staff and participation in special programs make little or no difference for inmate perspectives." (1974:9)

Support for the importation model is indicated:

> Younger inmates, educated inmates and inmates with urban backgrounds are more hostile towards the institution and its staff than older, less educated non-urban inmates. Similarly, felons appear to be more hostile than misdemeanants. Race, previous prison experiences and the violent-nonviolent offense dichotomy made virtually no difference for embracement of the inmate code among these female inmates.
>
> (1974:10)

When the four background variables are combined with the situational variables:

> the six variables collectively account for close to one-fourth of the variance in embracement of the inmate code. Both situational and background variables make some difference for inmate perspectives but of the six only the coefficients for age and felony status were statistically significant at the .05 level. Urban status and education are more weakly related than the two situational variables.
>
> (1974:10,11)

The most strongly related of the background variables is age and "it appears to have had an impact on attitudes towards the staff and institution which cannot be attributed to its association with other background or situational variables." (1974:11)

The analysis of the relation of situational and imported variables is consistent with previous work:

> the data do support critiques of the functionalist approach to the effect that characteristics imported into the prison shape inmate behavior and normative orientations. Background characteristics such as age appear to make for greater differences in inmate perspectives than do experiences, interaction and temporal isolation within the prison context.
>
> (1974:16)

Jensen suggests that "variability among different categories of inmates may provide some clues concerning inconsistencies in research thus far." (1975:15) Further examination of Jensen's findings are included in Chapter IV of this thesis where findings of the present research are compared with those Jensen reports.

This literature review indicates four main points: 1. research on the embracement of an inmate code has tended to emphasize either situational or imported variables; 2. research has focused primarily upon male inmate populations; 3. the few studies on female inmates suggest that sex is a significant imported inmate characteristic in that it appears to influence the relationship between situational variables and adherence to the inmate code; sex may also affect the relationship between other imported inmate characteristics and adherence to the inmate code; 4. research has not been conducted in Canada. This thesis examines the relationships between adherence to an inmate code and situational factors and imported inmate characteristics. The study is confined to imprisoned Canadian females.

Based on previous research the present study tests the following hypotheses:

1. A weak curvilinear relationship (u-shaped curve) exists between phase of institutional career and adherence to the inmate code. (Wheeler, 1965; Jensen, 1974, 1975)
2. No relationship exists between adherence to the inmate code and relationships with staff. (Jensen, 1974, 1975)
3. No relationship exists between contact with the outside community and adherence to the inmate code. (Jensen, 1974, 1975)
4. No relationship is expected between race and adherence to an inmate code. (Jensen, 1974, 1975)
5. A negative relationship exists between age and adherence to an inmate code. (Glaser, 1965; Jensen, 1974, 1975)
6. A positive relationship exists between education and adherence to an inmate code. (Jensen, 1974, 1975)

7. A positive relationship exists between urban background and adherence to an inmate code. (Jensen, 1974, 1975)
8. No relationship is expected between previous prison experience and adherence to an inmate code. (Jensen, 1974, 1975)
9. Inmates incarcerated for indictable offenses adhere to the inmate code to a greater extent than those incarcerated for summary conviction offenses. (Jensen, 1974, 1975)

CHAPTER III

METHODOLOGY

The population of sentenced female inmates from three correctional centres are included in this research. Both provincial prisoners (those serving two years less a day or less) as well as federal prisoners (those sentenced to over two years) are included.[4]

The institutions - Fort Saskatchewan, Alberta; Oakalla, British Columbia; and Twin Maples, British Columbia - provide facilities for sentenced females serving varying lengths of sentences for various offences. In addition, both Fort Saskatchewan and Oakalla also provide remand facilities. For these two institutions, then, the facilities are a mixture of minimum, medium and maximum security whereas Twin Maples is a minimum security cottage-style institution. All three institutions are located in or near major centres: Fort Saskatchewan is 15 miles northeast of the City of Edmonton; Oakalla is situated in the City of Burnaby, east of Vancouver; and Twin Maples is in the Town of Haney, east of Burnaby.

Permission was granted by each of the provincial governments to

---

[4] A federal-provincial agreement (1974) permits those females sentenced to over two years to serve their time in a provincial institution providing certain conditions are met. These include: the inmate's preference; the province's ability and willingness; and security considerations. This agreement allows those already serving their sentence in Kingston to serve the remainder of their sentences in a provincial correctional centre.

conduct research and institutional personnel extended full cooperation. Questionnaires were administered to Fort Saskatchewan inmates on two separate occasions, two months apart. Inmates included on the first occasion did not participate the second time. Questionnaires were administered to inmates of the British Columbia correctional centres over a three day period.

Staff were requested not to be present when the questionnaires were being administered. Groups of inmates were approached by the researcher who outlined the purpose of the study as a survey of female inmates and their attitudes; inmates were assured of anonymity. Inmates who declined to participate were approached a second time, usually the following day. When they refused or declined a second time, their reason was requested. In addition, when possible, inmates with incomplete questionnaires were approached and asked to complete their questionnaires.

Questionnaires were administered in lounges, kitchens, dormitories, individual rooms or cell blocks. Although inmates were usually in groups of two or more, there were occasions when conflicting schedules necessitated having questionnaires administered individually. In one case, for example, the questionnaire was read to the respondent as she did not wish to participate unless this method was used. Although not questioned about her literacy, she volunteered that she could read but did not like to read. This method of questionnaire administration is similar to Jensen's, as he

> concluded that we should vary the administration of the questionnaire depending on the reading ability of the inmates. Thus some inmates completed the questionnaire in groups of 25 and others in groups of two to six. Those who had a great difficulty understanding the questionnaire were either read the items and

> allowed to indicate their responses on separate cards or were interviewed individually.
>
> (1974:6)

The total number of usable questionnaires is 117. Fifty-five inmates from Fort Saskatchewan participated; 44 from Oakalla and 18 from Twin Maples.

Four inmates from Fort Saskatchewan refused to participate in the study: one was "not interested" and one was leaving in a few days and considered her participation to be of no benefit to her; two inmates could not read English and although the researcher offered to read the questionnaires, they still declined. Their comprehension of the English language was limited and they did not wish to have the questionnaire translated into Cree. One other participant who could not speak or read English had another inmate translate the questionnaire for her; she and the other inmate made these arrangements themselves without interference or suggestions from institutional personnel or the researcher. The inmate who was "not interested" did not leave the room while questionnaires were being filled out; she preferred to remain and question participants, asking them to read questions to her. The researcher believes that this individual was unable to read; an offer to administer the questionnaire orally was promptly refused. The inmate remained and continued questioning participants.

Five inmates from Twin Maples did not participate: one inmate did not wish to complete the questionnaire; two inmates were on temporary leave passes from the institution and therefore not available at the time questionnaires were administered; and two inmates refused to participate. The coding in the margin of the questionnaire led the latter two to believe that the information, via the computer, would

eventually be given to the CIA and FBI. They attempted to convince other inmates not to participate but they were unsuccessful. It was at this institution that the researcher was questioned in detail as to the nature of the study: who would have access to the information; a request from the inmate committee for a copy of the completed study; and finally, the researcher was asked to present identification to assure the inmates that she had no connection with the department of corrections. (A university student identification card, with a photograph on it, was presented).

Ten inmates from Oakalla did not participate. A total of five Doukhobour women were imprisoned at the time of the research and all five refused to participate but wanted to discuss their imprisonment with the researcher. These women were found guilty of arson: destruction of government property -- acts which they associate with their religious beliefs. At the time of the interviews these women had been fasting for three weeks and had been force fed for the first time that day; intravenous feeding had been employed prior to this forced feeding. Two other inmates were being released that day and indicated that there would be no advantage for them in participating; one inmate indicated that she was not interested (she was being transferred, by choice, to Kingston penitentiary); one inmate stated that she preferred not to participate and one inmate gave "no reason" as her reason for not participating. Only one completed questionnaire was not used. This inmate was being transferred to a provincial mental hospital later in the week. She was included in the study as she expressed a desire to participate - several messages were sent by this inmate to the researcher via staff and other inmates. The questionnaire was administered to this inmate in the

solitary confinement section of the institution. Although she appeared to understand the directions and verbally replied in a lucid manner, her completed questionnaire was unsuitable for the study.

As a point of possible interest, it should be mentioned that the research at Oakalla correctional centre was conducted the week following a sit-down strike by the inmates. Several inmates felt that this was an activity to be listed on the questionnaire. The inmates were most cooperative and offered additional information; their Inmate Advisory Committee representative was quite insistent about this as she encouraged fellow inmates to fill out the blank sides of the questionnaire sheets. This representative escaped from the institution on the second day of the research but she had filled out a questionnaire on the first day and is therefore included in this study. During the time of the research there were a number of media personnel allowed in the Oakalla correctional centre. During the research period television and newspaper reports were favouring coverage of the inmates' institutional conditions.

Operational Measures

The extent of commitment to an inmate code was defined in terms used by Jensen:

> The dependent variable in the present analysis...has been referred to variably as 'subscription,' 'embracement' or 'commitment' to an 'inmate code.' As delineated in the literature such a code consists of five maxims (Cressey, 1969:175-175): (1) Do not divulge information, (2) Do not respect the staff, (3) Do not weaken, submit or accept, (4) Refrain from quarrels with other inmates, and (5) Do not exploit fellow inmates...We limited our measure to items reflecting conflict with authority and organizational expectations at the correctional center. The final measure used in the present analysis was based on responses to four items selected on the basis of a factor analysis: (1) 'The officers here deserve respect because they are only doing their job,' (2) 'If an inmate knows

> that another inmate is planning to escape, she should tell an officer,' (3) 'Inmates should tell the staff when somebody breaks the rules,' and (4) 'I enjoy taking part in the activities that go on around here.' These items were standardized, weighted, and added to form an index of 'subscription to the inmate code.'
>
> (Jensen, 1974:7)

It should be emphasized that this index of subscription to an inmate code reflects only the attitudes expressed by the inmates, not their actual behavior.

Only the first three of Jensen's items were used in this thesis. The fourth item was not included in the index as it did not correlate significantly (see Table 1) when compared with the other items reflecting inmate attitudes and beliefs. Furthermore, the fourth item was ambiguously interpreted by the inmates - they were uncertain if activities referred to work or recreational activities or both. When questioned, the interviewer indicated that it referred to recreational and leisure time activities. The reason for specifying activities in this manner was due to the verbal indication from several inmates that activities did not include work. It could include such programs as Alcoholics Anonymous, Native Sisterhood, self-help or drug therapy groups. These programs, however, are organized and managed primarily by outside agencies or by inmates themselves so enjoyment of such activities or participation in them would not indicate conformity to staff norms or low conformity to the inmate code. For each of the three items inmates were asked to indicate their degree of agreement: strongly agree, agree, disagree, strongly disagree. A total score was then calculated for each inmate by adding the score on each item; the range of scores is from 2 to 12. Initially, the code adherence scores were dichotomized into high and low with 48% of the inmates included in the low category (scoring 9 or less)

and 52% included in the high category (with scores ranging from 10 to the highest possible score, 12). When gamma measures of association were computed (see page 29), individual code adherence scores were calculated and placed on a 5 point scale. Fifteen per cent of the inmates were included in the lowest scoring category; 19% in the next highest; 14% in the middle; 19% in the second highest and 34% in the highest score category.

TABLE 1

PEARSON CORRELATION COEFFICIENTS AMONG INMATE CODE INDEX ITEMS

1.respect staff	2.infórm of escape	3.rule-infraction	4.enjoy activities
1.	.55	.48	.07
2.		.71	.09
3.			.02
4.			

The concept of situational influences refers to institutional experiences. This was defined in terms of career phase within the prison, relations with staff, and contact with the outside community. Career phase was measured in terms of first third, middle third and last third of sentence (early, middle and late phase). Fifty-eight per cent of the inmates are placed in early phase, 23% in middle phase and 19% in late phase. Each inmate reported both the length of her sentence and how

much of that sentence she had already served.[5] Individual phase placement was calculated on the basis of each inmate's sentence: the sentence was divided into thirds and the individual placed in early, middle or late phase according to their present sentence status. If they had a sentence of one year, for example, and at the time of the research had served two months, they were placed in the early phase; if an inmate was sentenced to three months and had served two and a half months, she was placed in the late phase of her institutional career. Jensen illustrates the problem of determining institutional career phase:

> neither Heffernan nor Ward and Kassebaum indicate the procedures used to operationalize career phase although they imply a straightforward replication of Wheeler. However, it is obvious from Tittle's study that what is 'early,' 'middle' and 'late' in an institutional career may be variable from one setting to another such that a complete replication might be misleading...it may be that the difference among the several studies of women in prison are a product of variable operational and analytic procedures.
>
> (1975:16)

Relations with staff was measured by asking inmates to report the extent of their dependence on staff for help and support. This item was dichotomized and the frequency distribution reveals that 59% of the inmates express some dependence on staff for help and support; this is considered high dependence. 41% of the inmates expressed low dependence. Jensen measured relations with staff as either contact with treatment staff or friendship with staff. Neither of these measures was considered appropriate for the present study because of a skewed distribution for the question measuring friendship with staff and because of a lack of

---

[5] The exact wording of this question, as well as all other items. can be found in the questionnaire in Appendix A. In addition, the frequency distribution for each item is reported in Appendix B.

treatment personnel for inmates to have contact with. Further discussion of this item is included in Chapter V.

Contact with the outside community is measured by the number of visits from family and friends and the inmate's expressed dependence on family and friends outside the prison. Thirty-nine percent of the inmates indicate that they receive a high number of visits (they report receiving visits on all, most or some of the visiting days) whereas 61% report receiving a low number of visits (visits on a few or none of the visiting days). Fifty-eight percent of the inmates indicate that they usually or always depend on friends and relatives outside for help and support. Both of these response categories, number of visits and dependence on friends and relatives, are considered as indicating high community contact.

Information on the imported inmate characteristics of race, age, education, residential background, previous prison experience and type of offence were collected from the inmates' official records as well as from the questionnaires.

Education was originally dichotomized into low (grade 9 or less) and high (grade 10, 11, high school graduation and post secondary schooling). Grades 10 and 11 were included in the same category as high school graduation and post secondary schooling as these grades are the usual prerequisites for entrance into technical and vocational schools. Some inmates listed both grade 10 or 11 (some high school but did not graduate) as well as post secondary schooling. Their files and personal interviews indicated that they had technical or vocational training. Another reason for establishing the cutting point at grade 9 or less is that nearly 39% of the respondents fell into this category. The next

level of education (some high school but did not graduate) plus the categories including grade 9 and less constituted 74% of the population thus resulting in a skewed distribution (see frequency distribution, Appendix B).

Race was dichotomized into two categories: 1. Indians and Metis (38%) and 2. whites and others (62%); only five respondents are in the category of "other." Prior imprisonment is dichotomized into those having no previous prison records (31%) and those with records (69%).

Residential status was originally dichotomized into rural and urban areas with 40% of the inmates from small town or country areas and 60% from city areas. Type of offence was either indictable or non-indictable; 82% are included in the more serious category (indictable) and 18% are in the non-indictable category. Age was dichotomized into younger (aged 25 and younger - 64%) and older (ages 26 to 56 - 36%).

The variables were originally dichotomized and cross-tabulations were computed. A second measure -- gamma -- was also considered. Variables were measured on a 5 point scale (except for residence and race) and gamma associations were computed. Details of relevant findings are included in Chapters IV and V. The frequency distributions in Appendix B indicate the ordered categories for the variables. A gamma measure of association was chosen as the mode of analysis as it "is not limited by marginal frequencies" (Mueller, Scheussler, Costner, 1970: 286). Small cell sizes in many cases made further cross-tabulations inappropriate.

CHAPTER IV

DATA ANALYSIS

Inmate code adherence scores, initially dichotomized into high and low, are cross-tabulated with each of the independent variables. The zero-order cross-tabulations of phase, type of offence, dependence on staff, race, age, and prior imprisonment indicate the existence of relationships between these variables and the dependent variable, expressed code adherence. No relationship is found when inmate code is cross-tabulated with educational levels, place of residence, dependence on friends and relatives outside and number of visits. Zero-order cross-tabulations of all the independent variables with inmate code adherence scores are presented in this chapter. The cross-tabulations for situational factors are presented first followed by a brief explanation of each finding; the imported variables are then presented and briefly discussed.

Situational Factors and Code Commitment

The weak curvilinear relationship expected between institutional career phase and adherence to the inmate code is found. Data presented in Table 2 support this finding. Among inmates in the early phase, 51% express high code adherence as do 67% of middle phase and 41% of late phase inmates. The difference between the middle and late phases is

greater than that between the early and middle phases. A 26 percentage point difference is noted for the former relationship and a 16 percentage point difference for the latter. This finding of a weak curvilinear relationship is in accordance with Wheeler's work (1961) as well as findings reported by Tittle (1969) and Jensen (1974, 1975). Further evidence in support of this conclusion is illustrated by the weak gamma value (.06) between phase of institutional career and adherence to the inmate code.[6]

TABLE 2

CODE ADHERENCE BY INSTITUTIONAL CAREER PHASE

		Institutional Career Phase			
		Early	Middle	Late	
Code Adherence	High	51% (34)	67% (18)	41% (9)	53% (61)
	Low	49% (33)	33% (9)	59% (13)	47% (55)
	Total	58% (67)	23% (27)	19% (22)	N = 116

No relationship is expected between adherence to the inmate code and relationships with staff. However, as measured by dependence on staff for help and support, a relationship is revealed. Table 3 shows 43% of inmates who usually depend on staff compared to 70% of those who do not depend on staff expressing high code adherence, a difference of 27 percentage points. Further evidence of this relationship is found in the zero-order gamma values between dependence on staff and code (-.37); code adherence is negatively associated with dependence on staff.

---

[6] For the purpose of calculating the gamma value. code adherence was measured on a 5 point scale from low to high inmate code commitment. (See pages 26 and 29).

Therefore the original hypothesis must be rejected and we can tentatively conclude that those inmates less dependent upon staff for help and support express a higher degree of adherence to the inmate code.

TABLE 3

CODE ADHERENCE BY DEPENDENCE ON STAFF

		Dependence on Staff		
		High	Low	
Code Adherence	High	43% (29)	70% (32)	54% (61)
	Low	57% (38)	30% (14)	46% (52)
	Total	59% (67)	41% (46)	N = 113

It is hypothesized that there will be no relationship between adherence to an inmate code and contact with the outside community. With number of visits used as a measure of community contact, no relationship is found between this situational variable and code commitment. Table 4 presents the data for evaluating this finding. Among inmates who receive a high number of visits, 55% indicate strong code commitment and among inmates who have fewer visits or less community contact, 51% express high code adherence. Based on the findings presented in Tables 4 and 5, the community contact variable will not be examined any further except as a control variable. Gamma values are not calculated for either number of visits or the other measure of community contact, dependence on friends and relatives outside.

TABLE 4

CODE ADHERENCE BY NUMBER OF VISITS

		High number of visits	Low number of visits	
Code Adherence	High	55% (24)	51% (36)	53% (60)
	Low	46% (20)	49% (34)	47% (54)
	Total	39% (44)	61% (70)	N = 114

No relationship is expected between code adherence and dependence on friends and relatives outside the prison--the second measure of community contact. As illustrated in Table 5, no relationship is found between expressed code adherence and dependence on friends and relatives outside. Fifty-seven percent of the inmates who usually depend on friends and relatives outside express strong code commitment as do 48% of the inmates who do not usually depend on this type of community contact. As expected, then, neither measure of community contact is found to have a relationship with adherence to the inmate code.

TABLE 5

CODE ADHERENCE BY DEPENDENCE ON FRIENDS AND RELATIVES OUTSIDE

		Dependence on Friends and Relatives		
		High Dependence	Low Dependence	
Code Adherence	High	57% (38)	48% (23)	53% (61)
	Low	43% (29)	52% (25)	47% (54)
	Total	58% (67)	42% (48)	N = 115

Further examination is conducted between the situational variables of institutional career phase and dependence on staff and the dependent variable of code commitment (measured by the 5 ordered categories from low to high - see pages 25 and 26). These situational variables and code commitment are also measured with the imported characteristics of race, age, education, residence and prior imprisonment as control variables. As indicated on page 29, selection of the gamma method for further specification is due to gamma not being limited by marginal frequencies.

Table 6 presents a summary of the zero-order gamma values between institutional career phase and code adherence and between dependence on staff and code adherence. Table 7 presents gamma values when controlling for third variables. A comparison can be made between the original zero-order gamma values and the "conditional" gammas (i.e. the gamma scores calculated between code commitment and the independent variables for each level or category of the control variables).

TABLE 6

SITUATIONAL VARIABLES BY CODE

	N	Gamma
Institutional Career Phase by Code Adherence	112	.06
Dependence on Staff by Code Adherence	112	- .37

As Table 7 illustrates, race, age and education appear to be imported characteristics which affect the original weak phase-code relationship. The introduction of the race variable has the greatest effect among the

natives where the relationship between phase and code adherence is increased in strength (from the zero-order gamma of .06 to .25). Among non-natives the relationship is decreased slightly and becomes negative (-.06).

The age variable also affects the original phase-code finding. Among younger inmates there appears to be a somewhat stronger relationship than originally observed (an increase from .06 to .17). However, among older inmates no relationship between code and phase appears to exist.

Lower levels of education (completion of junior high school - grade 9 - or less) have little effect on the phase-code relationship but higher levels of education do appear to have some effect. This is not a strong relationship, however, as the gamma value is only increased to .13 from the original .06.

Detailed discussion of these findings, as well as other findings reported in this chapter, are included in Chapter V.

Table 8 illustrates the relationships between dependence on staff and code commitment when controlling for third variables. For both categories of race there is a change in the original dependence on staff-code adherence relationship. Among native inmates the gamma value is reduced from -.37 to -.24 while the gamma is increased to -.45 among non-natives.

Age also affects the original relationship. Among younger inmates gamma is reduced to -.21 compared to an increase to -.60 for older inmates. Among older inmates, then, there is a fairly strong inverse relationship between dependence on staff and code adherence.

TABLE 7

PHASE BY CODE (.06) BY CONTROL VARIABLES

	N	Gamma
Race		
Native	43	.25
Non-native	72	-.06
Age		
Younger (ages 19 to 25)	73	.17
Older (ages 29 to 56)	42	-.004
Education		
Grade 9 or less	45	-.03
Some high school and beyond	70	.13
Residence		
Small town and country areas	44	.05
City areas	68	.09
Prior Imprisonment		
No prior prison record	35	.05
Some prior prison record	79	-.04

Lower levels of education affect the original dependence on staff-code adherence relationship; there is a reduction in the gamma value to -.29 from the initial -.37 value. Among inmates with higher levels of education the relationship between dependence on staff and code commitment is not changed from that originally observed.

For inmates from small town and country areas the predictability of code commitment is reduced slightly whereas it is increased to a gamma value of -.51 for those from cities.

The introduction of prior imprisonment affects the original relationship. Among inmates with no prior imprisonment records, the association is strengthened while among those with prison records the

association is slightly weakened. For the former group reduction in predictive error is increased to 51% from the original level of 37%. Therefore, among inmates without prior prison records, the inverse relationship between dependence on staff and code adherence is substantially strengthened.

TABLE 8

DEPENDENCE ON STAFF BY CODE (-.37) BY CONTROL VARIABLES

	N	Gamma
Race		
Native	40	-.24
Non-native	72	-.45
Age		
Younger	70	-.21
Older	42	-.60
Education		
Lower levels	44	-.29
Higher levels	68	-.37
Residence		
Small town and country areas	42	-.26
Cities	67	-.51
Prior Imprisonment		
No prior prison record	34	-.51
Some prior prison record	77	-.29

Imported Characteristics and Code Commitment

No relationship was expected between code adherence and race. As revealed in Table 9, however, a significant difference exists for while 39% of the Natives express high code adherence (code dichotomized), 61%

of the non-native inmates express high code commitment. Therefore race appears to have a moderately strong relationship with inmate code commitment. The gamma value (.31) shown in Table 15 provides further support for this race-code adherence relationship. It appears that non-native inmates indicate higher code adherence than native inmates.

TABLE 9

CODE ADHERENCE BY RACE

		Natives	Non-natives	
Code Adherence	High	39% (17)	61% (44)	53% (61)
	Low	61% (27)	39% (28)	47% (55)
	Total	38% (44)	62% (72)	N = 116

A negative relationship between age and commitment to an inmate code is expected. There is evidence in support of the hypothesis since a moderately strong inverse relationship appears to exist between age and code commitment. Sixty-one percent of the younger inmates scored high on code commitment compared to 38% of the older inmates, a difference of 23 percentage points (see Table 10). The gamma value for age and code commitment (-.12) provides some support for this finding. It appears that younger inmates adhere more to the inmate code than do older inmates.

A positive relationship is predicted between education and adherence to an inmate code but, as revealed in Table 11, no relationship is found. Fifty-four percent of those with higher levels of education and 51% of those with lower levels of education express strong code commitment (dichotomized). This imported variable of education is not

explored any further other than as a control variable (see Tables 16, 17 and 18).

TABLE 10

CODE ADHERENCE BY AGE

		Younger	Older	
Code Adherence	High	61% (45)	38% (16)	53% (61)
	Low	39% (29)	62% (26)	47% (55)
	Total	64% (74)	36% (42)	N = 116

TABLE 11

CODE ADHERENCE BY EDUCATION

		Higher Levels	Lower Levels	
Code Adherence	High	54% (38)	51% (23)	53% (61)
	Low	47% (33)	49% (22)	47% (55)
	Total	61% (71)	39% (45)	N = 116

It is hypothesized that a positive relationship exists between urban background and adherence to an inmate code: those from urban backgrounds are expected to show higher levels of code commitment. Table 12 presents data indicating almost no difference in code commitment (dichotomized) between inmates from urban backgrounds (53% score on high code) and inmates from small town and country areas (49% score on high adherence). This imported variable is not examined any further other than as a control variable (see Tables 16, 17 and 18).

TABLE 12

CODE ADHERENCE BY RESIDENCE

		Rural	Urban	
Code Adherence	High	49% (22)	53% (36)	51% (58)
	Low	51% (23)	47% (32)	49% (55)
	Total	40% (45)	60% (68)	N = 113

Data presented in Table 13 reveal a weak relationship between code adherence (dichotomized) and prior prison experience although no relationship had been expected. 42% of the inmates without prior imprisonment records and 58% of those with records indicate high code adherence - a difference of 16 percentage points. The gamma value (.30) for prior imprisonment and code commitment supports this finding. It appears that inmates with prior prison experience express higher code commitment. This variable is examined further (see Table 18) later in this chapter.

TABLE 13

CODE ADHERENCE BY PRIOR IMPRISONMENT RECORD

		No Prior Imprisonment	Some Prior Imprisonment	
Code Adherence	High	42% (15)	58% (46)	53% (61)
	Low	58% (21)	43% (34)	47% (55)
	Total	31% (36)	69% (80)	N = 116

It had also been predicted that for inmates incarcerated for

indictable offences, code adherence will be stronger than for those incarcerated for non-indictable offences. Table 14 shows that 59% of those sentenced for the more serious indictable offences express strong code adherence (dichotomized) compared with 15% of those imprisoned for the less serious non-indictable offence category - a difference of 44 percentage points. It therefore appears that type of offence, as measured here, has a strong relationship with code commitment. However, because of the small number of cases involved in the non-indictable offense category (20 inmates - 17% of the population), caution must be exercised in interpreting this result and further examination of this variable will therefore not be considered.

TABLE 14

CODE ADHERENCE BY TYPE OF OFFENSE

		Indictable	Non-Indictable	
Code Adherence	High	59% (57)	15% (3)	52% (60)
	Low	41% (39)	85% (17)	48% (56)
	Total	83% (96)	17% (20)	N = 116

As indicated above, the imported characteristics of race, age and prior prison record all affect the extent of code commitment (dichotomized). Table 15 presents the gamma measures of association between those background variables and code commitment. Tables 16, 17 and 18 present gamma values for these variables and code commitment when controlling for third variables.

TABLE 15

CODE ADHERENCE BY IMPORTED VARIABLES

	N	Gamma
Race	115	.31
Age	115	-.12
Prior Imprisonment	114	.30

Table 16 illustrates the relationship between race and code commitment when controlling for third variables. There is only a slight effect noted on the original race-code adherence gamma association (.31) among younger inmates but for older inmates, predictability is reduced to .14. A greater effect on the race-code adherence finding is found for the older inmates. The relationship between code adherence and race, then, is not as strong among older inmates.

TABLE 16

CODE ADHERENCE BY RACE (.31) BY CONTROL VARIABLES

	N	Gamma
Age		
Younger	73	.37
Older	42	.14
Residence		
Rural	44	.36
Urban	68	.33
Education		
Lower levels	45	.13
Higher levels	70	.46
Prior Imprisonment		
None	35	.38
Some	79	.41

Place of residence does not have a significant effect on the race-code adherence relationship. Among inmates with lower levels of education, however, an effect on the original finding is noted. Among inmates with lower levels of education, predictability is reduced to .13 from the original .31 whereas for inmates with higher levels of education there is an increase to .46. Higher levels of education, then, can be seen to affect the race-code adherence finding.

The introduction of prior imprisonment as a control variable affects the original race-code adherence relationship. Predictability is increased slightly (to .38 from the original .31) for inmates without prior prison experience and predictability is increased to .41 for those with prior prison experience. A slight strengthening effect is noted, then, for both categories of prior prison record.

The zero-order relationship between age and code adherence (-.12) does not appear to be significantly altered by the introduction of the control variable of race (see Table 17). Among native inmates predictability is decreased slightly (to -.07) and among non-native inmates it is increased slightly (to -.16).

Among inmates with lower levels of education, the original age-code adherence association is strengthened to -.30 but among those with higher levels of education predictability is reduced to .01. Education, particularly lower levels, appears to affect the age-code adherence relationship. The code adherence-age relationship is strengthened for inmates with lower levels of education.

Residence, both rural and urban, affects the age-code adherence relationship. Among inmates from rural areas, the original finding disappears whereas for those from urban areas the finding is increased

to -.24 from the original -.12. Among inmates from city areas, then, the age-code adherence finding is much stronger.

Both categories of prior imprisonment affect the age-code adherence relationship. There is a slight weakening effect for inmates with prior prison records but a significant strengthening for inmates without prior prison records.

TABLE 17

CODE ADHERENCE BY AGE (-.12) BY CONTROL VARIABLES

	N	Gamma
Race		
Native	43	-.07
Non-native	72	-.16
Education		
Lower levels	45	-.30
Higher levels	70	.01
Residence		
Rural	44	-.01
Urban	68	-.24
Prior Imprisonment		
None	35	-.35
Some	79	-.04

The zero-order gamma association between prior prison record and code adherence is .30 (see Table 18); we can predict code adherence on the basis of a prior prison record with a 30% reduction in prediction error. With the exception of the race variable, the prior record-code adherence association is affected when controlling for third variables. Among younger inmates predictability is reduced to .14 compared with an increase to .61 among older inmates. The prior-code adherence

relationship is more significant among older inmates.

Among inmates from rural areas, predictability is decreased to .20 from the original .30 but it is increased slightly (to .38) among inmates from urban areas. The prior-code adherence relationship, then, is not as significant when predicting for inmates from rural areas.

When controlling for inmates with lower levels of education, the original prior-code adherence association is affected as predictability increases to .49 from the original .30. For inmates with higher levels of education, however, predictability is decreased to .22. Among inmates with lower levels of education, then, the prior imprisonment-code adherence finding is more significant.

TABLE 18

CODE ADHERENCE BY PRIOR PRISON RECORD (.30) BY CONTROL VARIABLES

	N	Gamma
Race		
Native	42	.36
Non-native	72	.31
Age		
Younger	72	.14
Older	42	.61
Education		
Lower levels	44	.49
Higher levels	70	.22
Residence		
Rural	43	.20
Urban	68	.38

SUMMARY OF MAJOR FINDINGS

Institutional Career Phase

When cross-tabulating institutional career phase with inmate code adherence (dichotomized), a weak curvilinear relationship is found. This weak relationship is only barely visible when measuring the association between phase and code using gamma as a measure of association. When controlling for third variables this original finding is altered slightly. A slightly increased effect is noted among younger inmates and among those inmates with higher levels of education. A somewhat stronger effect is noted among natives but even here the gamma value is only increased to .25 from the original value of .06. The zero-order relationship becomes even weaker and opposite in direction among those with some prior imprisonment, the non-natives, the older inmates, and the less educated. Although a more detailed discussion of these and other findings is given in Chapter V, generally we can conclude that if anything only a very weak relationship exists between institutional career phase and code adherence.

Dependence on Staff

The zero-order cross-tabulation presented in Table 5 indicates a fairly strong inverse relationship between dependence on staff and inmate code adherence (dichotomized). Support is also found for this conclusion from the gamma values between dependence on staff and code commitment (zero-order gamma is -.37). Further evidence is found when controlling for third variables (see Table 8); this negative relationship between dependence on staff and code commitment is supported

although the magnitude of the relationship varies somewhat by category of the control variables. The dependence on staff-code commitment finding is slightly increased when controlling for non-natives and the relationship is weakened for natives. A significant increase is noted for the older category of age and a decrease for the younger age category. Age has the greatest effect on the original finding. Higher levels of education do not affect the dependence on staff-code adherence relationship but lower levels do have a slight decreasing effect. Among urban residents, the original finding is strengthened somewhat to the point where reduction in predictive error is increased to 51% compared to the zero-order level of 37%; for small town and country residents this figure is decreased to 26%. Among inmates without prior imprisonment records, reduction in predictive error is also increased to 51% while among inmates with prior records, the original dependence on staff-code commitment relationship is slightly weakened. Generally, however, we must conclude that our original hypothesis is not supported; an inverse relationship between dependence on staff and code adherence appears to exist. However, we have also been able to begin to specify this relationship.

Race

Cross-tabulations of race and code adherence (dichotomized) indicate that a relationship exists (Table 9): non-natives exhibit more code commitment. The gamma measure of association for these two variables (.30) is supportive of this finding. When controlling for third variables (see Table 16), the original race-code gamma association is affected to the greatest extent by education: the zero-order relationship is strengthened significantly among the higher educated with a corresponding decrease among the less educated inmates. In addition, among older inmates a

significant decrease in the strength of the original relationship is observed. Other variables (younger age, both categories of residential status and prior prison record) have only a slight but strengthening effect. Therefore, we would conclude that a relationship between race and expressed code commitment appears to exist although again we note effects on this relationship when other variables are considered. Further discussion of this finding is reported in Chapter V.

Age

The negative relationship between age and code (dichotomized) is illustrated in Table 10; the zero-order gamma measure of association between age and code is -.12. When controlling for third variables (see Table 17), this negative association is strengthened under the conditions of lower levels of education, city residence and no prior imprisonment, while a decrease in the strength of this relationship is noted under the conditions of higher levels of education, rural residence and some prior imprisonment. So although support for the expectation of a negative relationship between age and code adherence is obtained, the magnitude of this negative relationship appears to vary substantially by category of selected control variables.

Prior Imprisonment Record

The initial prior imprisonment-code (dichotomized) cross-tabulation indicates that a positive relationship exists (Table 13) and the gamma measure of association (.30) is further evidence of this. When controlling for third variables, as shown in Table 18, there is a substantial strengthening effect of the original prior imprisonment-code gamma association for the older age category (gamma is increased

to .61); and for lower levels of education gamma is increased to .49. A decrease in the strength of the original relationship is noted for higher levels of education, rural residence and particularly among younger inmates (gamma is reduced to .14). The other effects - for both categories of race and for urban residence - while only slight, are supportive of the original finding. Again we can conclude that the original hypothesis is not supported since a relationship between prior imprisonment experience and expressed code commitment appears to exist. However, this relationship is also observed to vary by category of selected control variables.

CHAPTER V

CONCLUSIONS

The intention of this chapter is to discuss the significant findings reported in Chapter IV. General trends are examined and possible explanations suggested. In addition comparisons with Jensen's study are discussed. The situational variables of institutional career phase, community contact, and dependence on staff are presented first, followed by the findings related to the imported variables of race, age, levels of education, residence, prior imprisonment and type of offense.

Differences between the situational and importation models are indicated. In addition, suggestions for future study in this area are offered.

Institutional Career Phase and Code Adherence

The hypothesis concerning institutional career phase and expressed code adherence is based on previous research by Wheeler (1961); Tittle (1969) and Jensen (1974, 1975). The findings of the present thesis are similar to those reported for other studies of females (Jensen and Tittle): only a weak curvilinear relationship between phase of institutional career and code commitment is found. This relationship is affected by certain control variables. The effects of these variables with the possible exception of the native category of race are, however,

slight and under some conditions opposite in sign. The original phase-code finding remains, if anything, very weak.

Although this research includes females serving shorter provincial sentences as well as inmates serving penitentiary time, sentence lengths are still quite short: 83% are serving 24 months or less; 59% are serving 12 months or less (see Appendix B). One could speculate, then, that an institutional career phase would not have as great an effect on code adherence as it would if the sentences were longer. An inmate in the middle of a 3 month sentence, for example, is probably not going to notice that she is at the half-way mark of her sentence as readily as an inmate serving 2, 3 or more years. The exact sentence lengths in previous studies are not always available but since the previous research includes felons it could be assumed that the sentences are longer. Also, the sentences must have been of considerable length as phase is determined by Wheeler, for example, in terms of 6 month periods, a method not possible with the present data. In some reports (Jensen), shorter sentences are eliminated. This method is not possible in the present study given the sentence length distribution. Furthermore, as indicated in the methodology chapter, various methods are employed for measuring institutional phase, with different rationales offered by the different researchers.

Jensen discusses the relevance of institutional career phase as a determinant of code commitment when he notes the suggestion that "the most commonly advanced model seems most relevant to maximum security institutions and least adequate for 'minimum security' or 'open' institutions." (Jensen, 1974:12; Garrity, 1961). One of the institutions

included in the present thesis, Twin Maples, is an open correctional centre; the other two, Oakalla and Fort Saskatchewan, have security classifications ranging from minimum to maximum, the latter classification primarily for the remanded rather than the sentenced inmates. Therefore, it is possible that the weak relationship observed between code adherence and career phase may be at least partly attributable to the type of institutions studied in the present research.

The general conclusion of the present research that, at best, only a very weak relationship exists between career phase and code commitment is similar to the findings of Jensen and Tittle. Jensen concluded that although his study and that reported by Tittle "seem to suggest similar patterns the relationship is not particularly impressive." (1974:9) Although Tittle and Jensen report a phase-code relationship, Jensen points out: "the differences using our data were statistically insignificant (chi-square)...and computations using Tittle's data show his differences to be statistically insignificant as well." (1974:9)

The variable of race has the greatest effect on the phase-code relationship, with a stronger relationship noted among the native inmates. The frequency distribution for natives' sentence lengths (see Appendix B) illustrates the short sentences being served by the majority of the native inmates; 49% are serving sentences of 4 months or less; 56% are serving sentences of 6 months or less. This finding, then, that the phase-code adherence relationship is strengthened among native inmates is probably an artifact resulting from the extremely short sentences for natives. Also, adherence to an inmate code as measured here may itself be inapplicable for native inmates - there is a possibility that native inmates have a separate code from the white inmates. This suggestion is discussed in more detail when reporting on the race variable later in

this chapter.

The major differences between the present study and previous work are the lengths of sentences of the respondents and the methods of determining career phase. Previous studies include inmates sentenced for longer periods of time than inmates included in the present research. It should be emphasized again that 83% of the population included here are serving sentences of 24 months or less; this sentence will result in approximately 17-1/2 months' actual incarceration when "good time" is deducted from the total sentence. A 12 month sentence is less than 9 months' actual imprisonment and the 46% of the inmates serving 6 months or less could spend less than 4-1/2 months actually in prison.

Community Contact and Code Adherence

The zero-order cross-tabulation indicates support for the hypothesis concerning community contact and expressed adherence to the inmate code. Neither measure of community contact - number of visits or dependence on friends and relatives outside - is found to affect expressed code commitment. This finding is the same as that reported by Jensen (1974:9).

The number of visits received is probably affected by the geographic location of the correctional centre as well as the sentence lengths. It might not be practical or possible for friends and relatives to visit when distance from the institution involves travelling time and expenses. Visiting is also affected by the length of sentence: if an inmate is serving a short sentence (46% are serving 6 months or less) - it may not be worth the time and trouble for geographically distant friends and relatives to visit. It should be recalled at this point

that the institutions included in this study are the only facilities available for females in each of the two provinces.[7] And such isolation of facilities is contrary to the suggestions of the Report of the Canadian Committee on Corrections (Ouimet Report, 1969) which indicates a need for correctional facilities to be part of the community they serve.

Atchley and McCabe (1968) indicate the possible effects of isolation from the community (1968:782). They suggest that less community contact may force inmates to turn to other inmates and therefore to indicate stronger code adherence. This view is reinforced by Giallombardo's comment on geographic isolation:

> except for interaction with other inmates, the only other human contact is with staff members. Although this lack of intrusion from the outside world facilitates an inmate's induction into the inmate social system from a treatment standpoint, the social consequences may be quite costly.
>
> (1966:77)

Since no effect on code commitment is found for community contact in either the present study or in Jensen's work, the question becomes why was no relationship found?

The two measures employed - number of visits and reported dependence on friends and relatives - may not be valid indicators of community contact. We cannot conclude that community contact does not affect the extent of commitment to the inmate code as we may not be adequately

---

[7] British Columbia has a co-educational centre in Prince George but at the time of this research it was still considered to be in an "experimental" stage; only a few female inmates were selected to serve their sentences in this institution.

measuring the actual amount of contact.

Under circumstances of geographic location, the number of letters received and sent could be considered as another measure of community contact. This item, used by Jensen, is discarded from the present research because of the difficulty in determining whether inmates are referring to letters sent to other inmates in the institution ("kites") or if they are referring to friends and relatives in the community outside the prison. The question attempting to measure this type of community contact is worded in an ambiguous manner and it was only at the last institution that the researcher became aware of this when an inmate asked if the letters referred to those being received daily from another inmate. Also, the possibility of weekend passes and other forms of temporary absences is not explored as measures of community contact.

The types of institutions studied should also be considered. It may be that correctional institutions for females are not as "painful" as those of previous studies dealing with male inmates (notably Sykes). Therefore, there could be fewer "pains of imprisonment" for community contact to alleviate. Glaser, in discussing the physical construction of institutions, points out that "isolation from other inmates may be either fostered or impeded by the physical arrangement of prison housing units as well as by prison management decision on where particular inmates should be housed." (1969:100). Twin Maples, for example, has a cottage design and inmates are allowed to have their children visit in the facility for week-ends.

Another possibility to consider is the type of inmates receiving visits. Do recidivists not experience the "pains" of imprisonment to the same extent as offenders incarcerated for the first time and therefore not "need" community contact to the same extent? Seventy-eight

inmates report some prior imprisonment record and 32% of these inmates receive a high number of visits (they report receiving visits on all, most or some of the visiting days) compared with a high number of visits for 53% of the 36 inmates who have no prior record.

Relations with Staff and Code Adherence

No relationship is expected between relations with staff and adherence to the inmate code. This expectation is based upon Jensen's (1974, 1975) findings. The present research indicates that a fairly strong negative relationship exists between these variables.

Jensen (1975:20) measured relations with staff as either contact with treatment staff or friendship with staff. Neither of these measures is considered appropriate for the present study (see page 27). Jensen did not indicate the results of the questionnaire item measuring dependence on staff and this is the measure of relations with staff used in the present thesis. Because of the different measures used for relations with staff it is difficult to compare the present findings with those on which the hypothesis is based.

The finding presented here - namely, that as dependence on staff increases, expressed code adherence decreases - appears to be a reasonable expectation, in spite of Jensen's findings. The items included in the inmate code index reflect "conflict with authority and organizational expectations at the correctional center" (Jensen, 1974:7). The inmate code, then, can be viewed as reflecting attitudes which are in opposition to positive relations with staff. Glaser (1969) suggests that inmate-staff relations depend on the organization of the institution - with an authoritarian orientation, communication between staff and

inmates is limited and inmates relate to other inmates more frequently - stronger code adherence exists.

Jensen's measures of relations with staff (friendships with staff and contact with treatment staff), may have had opposite effects which resulted in his finding that no relationship exists between expressed code commitment and relations with staff. Contact with treatment staff is the formal arrangement (Glaser, 1969:76) of communication whereas friendship with staff is an informal contact. Contact with treatment staff implies formal contact for rehabilitative purposes; friendship with staff may be with either treatment or custodial staff. It is possible that inmates with high contact with treatment staff may have high code adherence and those with high friendship with staff have low code adherence. Furthermore, dependence on staff, the measure used in this study, does not necessarily mean friendship with staff. An inmate may rely on institutional personnel (custody or treatment) for help and support for such community contacts as employment possibilities, transportation arrangements, passes, contact with social agencies or other services. It may be then that this question is variously interpreted by the inmates. Dependence on staff and friendship with staff can be viewed as items measuring different aspects of relations with staff - they may even be in opposition to one another. Glaser reports that "the reasons for liking or disliking an official vary with his position." (1969:87). He indicates that while treatment personnel are "least frequently the most disliked...their relatively low frequency of selection for either the like or disliked designation suggests that they have less influence than other staff members on the prison experience of most inmates." (1969:86) Relations with staff, for this study, refers

primarily to custodial staff as there is no evidence to support significant contact with treatment personnel.

The zero-order inverse relationship between dependence on staff and code adherence is primarily affected by the control variables of age, residence and prior imprisonment record: the original relationship is strengthened among older inmates, among inmates from urban areas, and among those inmates without prior imprisonment records.

Among older inmates the dependence on staff-code adherence is substantially increased; among younger inmates it is decreased. Older inmates express lower code commitment than do younger inmates (see Table 10) and this might explain the effect on the dependence on staff-code adherence finding. Also, relations with staff may not be as easily established for younger inmates due to an age difference - although no data were collected, the researcher's impression is that most of the institutional personnel are in their late thirties or older; the mean age of the prison population is 25.

An increased effect on the moderate dependence on staff-code adherence finding is noted among inmates from urban areas. This effect is difficult to explain as residential status has little effect on code commitment. One should consider the variable of residence: if the assumption underlying the urban residence-code commitment hypothesis is that urban residence is related to more criminal contact, more crime, and increased possibility of prior imprisonment and therefore higher code adherence, the residential status item should be examined. The question asks: "In which of the following sorts of places have you lived for most of your life?" Respondents may choose: in the country, in a small town or in a city. By wording the question "for most of

your life" this item does not measure where the inmate had lived most recently. This measure, recency of residence, may be more indicative of criminal contacts and crime as they are related to urban residence.

A strengthening effect on the dependence on staff-code adherence relationship is noted among inmates without prior prison records. Lack of prior imprisonment could be viewed as having an effect on inmates' interactions with staff: those without prior records may be more amenable toward staff-inmate relations. As revealed in Table 13, inmates without prior imprisonment express lower code adherence than inmates with prison records.

Also to be considered when attempting to explain the relationship between dependence on staff and code commitment is the timing of the research particularly in British Columbia. As mentioned in Chapter III, the data collection was conducted the week following a sit-down strike by inmates. They were protesting institutional conditions in general but the mood of the population at the time of the research could have influenced inmates' feelings towards staff.

The differences in findings of this thesis and those reported by Jensen can be explained by different measures of relations with staff as well as differences in institutional types and populations. The present study includes a population with native inmates; lower levels of education than Jensen's sample; fewer treatment personnel available and institutions which are probably more geographically distant from home communities.

Race and Code Adherence

No relationship had been expected between race and expressed code

commitment but a relationship is found. This finding appears fairly strong and when controlling for third variables the zero-order gamma association is maintained or strengthened except for the older age category and for those with lower levels of education. Under these two conditions the race-code adherence finding is weakened.

The decreased effect on the race-code adherence finding among older inmates can be partly explained by the lower code adherence expressed by older inmates (see Table 10).

Among inmates with lower levels of education, the race-code adherence relationship is weakened. Forty-five inmates are included in the lower levels of education category; 53% of these are natives. The frequency distribution for educational levels for natives (see Appendix B) indicates that 98% have less than high school graduation and 53% have grade 9 or less - this latter category being the measure of lower levels of education for this thesis. And, as mentioned above, native inmates express lower code adherence.

A number of explanations can be offered for the difference in this study in the race and code commitment relationship compared to Jensen's finding. Jensen's study includes the racial categories of whites and blacks whereas this research includes whites and natives (Indians and Metis). The major difference in the sample and population is related to language and socialization differences. Natives may not speak English as their first language but blacks will; their black-culture "jargon" is still accepted or understood by the larger society as are idiosyncratic argot associated with other minorities. Socialization processes and normative orientations affect an inmate's code commitment. Giallombardo indicates that "a cohesive system with group allegiance... can provide a reference group..." (1974:2) which will help alleviate

any "pains of imprisonment." For native inmates, however, two aspects of imprisonment should be considered. Natives may not view the larger or dominant (white) inmate subculture as a source of comfort while in prison - language barriers and cultural differences as well as sentence length differences - may prevent native inmates from interacting with white inmates. Also, the prison may not provide as many "pains of imprisonment" for native inmates. Given the generally lower socio-economic status among natives, imprisonment may not be viewed as a deprivation experience. Support for this view is suggested by Jensen: "the prison experience may be irrelevant in the social world from which blacks...were removed and into which they are likely to return." (1975:14) While it is not intended to draw a direct comparison between natives and blacks, the socio-economic status of each group, as it relates to prison deprivation, can be compared. The question then becomes one concerning Jensen's finding: why didn't he find a relationship between race and code commitment? A possible explanation, of course, is that the inmate subculture is not as foreign to blacks as it is to native inmates; blacks are more assimilated into the larger, white culture than are natives. So while both racial categories, blacks and natives, may not feel the deprivation aspect of imprisonment to the same extent that white inmates do, a difference for blacks and natives can be seen with respect to the assimilation of an inmate code. This aspect of imprisonment, adherence to an inmate code, appears to be a difference for these races - native inmates express lower code commitment. Jensen suggests this when he notes that "official intervention has different consequences by race" (Jensen, 1975:14) He indicates a need for further study "to isolate the role of...variations in the

deprivational nature of imprisonment to various groups..." (1975:13) Support for cultural differences - "differential socialization" - is provided by Wheeler's research on Scandinavian prisons. Jensen reports that Wheeler "could find no evidence supporting traditional models of inmate culture and suggests that this departure from commonly cited patterns may reflect cultural differences in definitions of deprivation and appropriate response to law-breaking." (1975:12)

Age and code commitment

A negative relationship between code commitment and age had been predicted: younger inmates are expected to indicate stronger code adherence. This hypothesis is supported. The zero-order cross-tabulations reveal a higher commitment to the inmate code for younger inmates. Some additional support for this finding is indicated by the zero-order gamma association (-.12).

The effect of age on code commitment is explained by Jensen as follows: "age, like sex, appears to be one of those general features of American society which has consequences for inmate behavior, reactions to behavior and normative orientation towards the prison and its staff." (1974:11) This is supported by Glaser: "The difference between friendship and isolation-oriented inmates can be attributed to age. The younger inmates are much more concerned with making friends among other inmates than are the older ones." (1969:63)

Evidence from this research is such that support for the age-code adherence hypothesis is seen as age appears to affect the extent to which inmates express code commitment. This relationship is maintained when age is associated with code commitment through tabular analysis and

gamma measures. The mean age in Jensen's sample is 28 compared with 25 for this study so the two groups are sufficiently similar for comparison purposes. Jensen found that age is "the most strongly and persistently related background variable among our female inmates." (1974:11) Our findings are similar to Jensen's and we must conclude that a negative relationship exists between age and expressed adherence to an inmate code. Support for the diffusionist perspective is indicated as the findings presented here find age both strongly and persistently related in an inverse fashion to expressed code commitment.

When controlling for other variables there is a significant increase in the strength of the inverse age-code relationship for inmates from urban areas, for inmates with lower levels of education and for inmates without prior imprisonment.

Among inmates with lower levels of education the age-code adherence finding increases to -.30 from the original -.12; a slight decrease, to .01 is noted among inmates with higher levels of education. Again one should recall that the actual levels of education included are not as high as in Jensen's study and the range of educational levels is not that great (see pages 28, 63 and Appendix B). Table 11 shows that there is very little difference in expressed code adherence for inmates with either lower or higher levels of education. The present finding, that the age-code adherence relationship is strengthened among inmates with lower levels of education does not produce a significant relationship - predictability is only increased to 30%.

The effect of residential status on the code-age adherence finding, while strengthening the relationship substantially for urban residents, still does not indicate a strong relationship as predictability

is only increased to 24%. As noted in Table 12, residential status has little effect on code adherence. Also, the question measuring residential status asks where an inmate has lived for "most of your life" - this question does not measure recency of residence (see page 65). It is possible that a number of younger inmates, for example, lived most of their lives in a rural area but are recent residents of urban areas - and it is possible that urban areas are related to more crime and criminal contacts (see page 65 for further discussion of this).

The code adherence-age relationship is strengthened under the condition of no prior imprisonment. As indicated in Table 13, inmates without prior prison records indicate lower code adherence. Younger inmates, of course, have had less opportunity to have a prior prison record. It should be noted that it is prior imprisonment which is being measured here and not prior criminal record (see page 66 for further discussion of this variable). Another age-related aspect to consider is the peer group affiliation among younger people - younger inmates may be more susceptible to peer group pressure and therefore possibly to code adherence (see page 61, Glaser).

Education and Code Adherence

The hypothesis that education would affect code commitment is not supported. It was expected that as the level of education rises, commitment to the inmate code would increase. While Jensen finds that education affected code adherence (1974:10; 1975:7), he reports that "the association of...education...with acceptance of the inmate code appears to be a product of...association with age." (1975:21) Jensen gives us little information on education and why it might be related to

higher code adherence - he only reports his findings. His educational distribution, however, is different from the distribution in the present study: Jensen has 30% of his sample indicating junior high school or less; this study has 39% in this category; 46% of Jensen's respondents have some high school compared with only 35% of our population. It should be noted that Jensen does not indicate what type of education is included in "high school or more." Questions and comments directed by respondents at the researcher, indicate that "some schooling beyond high school" is not interpreted by the respondents of this study to mean the formal academic type of schooling. Several inmates indicate that although they had not completed high school they had entered vocational or trades training schools. For this study, then, "some schooling beyond high school" does not necessarily entail completion of high school. Sufficient information is not available to make a comparison with Jensen's sample for this category of education. The actual levels of education included in the present study are not particularly high. Since Jensen's questionnaire includes education to the graduate school level, it could be assumed that his sample included inmates with higher levels of education than are included in this research.

If one were assuming that a higher level of education would lead to a questioning of the formal institutional system and, as a result, increased adherence to the inmate code, one could not find this relationship with the educational levels included in this study. Also, when one considers the relationship between socio-economic status (of which education level is one indicator) and crime, an inverse relationship is usually reported. It might therefore be more reasonable to predict that lower education will be more significantly related to

expressed code adherence. There is a possibility that for this study the few inmates with higher levels of formal education are offender types which Schrag termed "square johns" - these "square jane" type inmates by definition are not involved with an inmate code. (Schrag, 1961).

Another question of comparison is the cutting points for different levels of education. Jensen trichotomizes education whereas the zero-order cross-tabulations of this study have dichotomized educational levels with junior high or less in the lower category (39% of the population are included) and the high levels of education category including some high school, high school completion and some schooling beyond high school. Only one inmate in this study indicated she had a university degree - a check of her files revealed she had attended a community college for 2 years but had not received a certificate.

Residence and Code Commitment

Jensen finds "inmates with urban backgrounds more hostile towards the institution and its staff than...non-urban inmates." (1974:10) The positive relationship predicted between urban residence and code commitment is not supported in this thesis.

If one considers the assumption underlying the urban residence-code commitment hypothesis[8] to be that urban residence is related to

---

[8] An "important characteristic of the offender is the place of residence. Statistics show that crime is more prevalent in cities than in rural areas. Female crime may be even more an urban phenomenon than male crime. The urban/rural ratio in 1967 was nine to one for female offenders and five to one for male offenders." (Royal Commission on the Status of Women, 1970:368).

more criminal contact, more crime, an increased possibility of a prior criminal record (which may or may not entail prior imprisonment), and therefore higher code adherence expressed, one should examine the item measuring residential status. The question asks: "In which of the following sorts of places have you lived for most of your life? (circle one) 1. in the country 2. in a small town (examples given) 3. in a city." By wording the question "for most of your life" this item does not measure where the inmate has lived most recently. This measure, recency of residence, may be more indicative of criminal contacts and crime as they are related to urban residence.

Prior Imprisonment and Code Adherence

No relationship between prior imprisonment and adherence to the inmate code was predicted. This is based on Jensen's finding: "previous prison experience...made virtually no difference for embracement of the inmate code." (1975:7) The present research reveals a positive relationship between prior imprisonment and expressed code commitment. This finding is significantly affected by control variables of age, rural residence and level of education.

It should be emphasized that it is prior imprisonment not prior criminal record or previous criminal contact which the present thesis is attempting to relate to code commitment. Prior imprisonment for females is affected by the courts' reluctance to incarcerate women. This is illustrated by the preferences for suspended sentences, probation, and fines as well as the relatively small female inmate population.[9] Prior prison record, therefore, is not the only measure of

---

[9] The Royal Commission on the Status of Women, 1970, pages 369, 375.

previous contact with criminal norms and values and it may be an inadequate measure of such prior contact given the sentencing procedures in Canada.

Jensen indicates that he uses prior imprisonment as an indicator of previous criminal contact and this is the measure used in this study. As mentioned earlier, this is probably not an adequate measure of previous criminal contact. In order to explain the differences in findings, knowledge of sentencing practices as applied to female offenders in both Canada and the United States is needed; a comparison of available alternatives to incarceration is necessary; and one must also consider the availability of intervention by other social agencies (e.g. drug programs, alcoholics' assistance, native associations).

The present finding that prior imprisonment affects the extent of expressed code commitment may be viewed in two ways: 1. those with prior prison records have, as a result of that experience, learned methods of survival (adhere to the inmate code); 2. those with prior prison records have a general value system which is conducive to code adherence - they have imported this characteristic, this life-style, into the prison environment and it has enabled them to adapt to the "pains of imprisonment." The difference, if any, between these two explanations is that it may not be prior imprisonment which has enabled the inmates to learn adaptive techniques; it may be previous criminal contact and this may or may not entail prior incarceration. One might assume that those with prior prison records did not reach the stage of imprisonment until after many contacts with the criminal subculture - they may have benefitted from alternatives to sentencing prior to any actual imprisonment. Therefore, by the time they were actually incarcerated they had extensive criminal contact. This suggests, then, that

Canadian female inmates may have benefitted from alternatives to imprisonment more than have American female inmates. Before generalizing from this suggestion, one must realize that differences may exist in alternatives to imprisonment between the two countries. There is a possibility that the female inmates included in Jensen's study are not as affected by prior imprisonment because they may have been incarcerated earlier in their criminal career than the Canadian inmates - the Americans may not have had as long a period of time for contact with the criminal values and norms. And of course there may be differences in the actual "pains" provided by different institutions.

The diffusion explanation is supported by the finding of this study - it appears that criminal values are imported into the prison environment (whether these values are learned from prior criminal contact with or without prior imprisonment); there is also a possibility that American inmates have had less frequent criminal contact.

The zero-order cross-tabulations show inmates with prior imprisonment experience expressing stronger code commitment than inmates without this experience. The gamma measure of association (.30) is supportive of this relationship. An increase in the strength of this relationship is noted when controlling for the older age category and also with lower levels of education; a decrease in the zero-order relationship is noted for the younger age category, for inmates with higher levels of education and for rural residence.

An explanation of the effect of age includes the observation that younger inmates have had less opportunity to have a prior prison record. Also, it may be that older inmates, with prior prison records, have a more extensive involvement in the criminal subculture.

The effect of lower levels of education on the prior-code adherence finding is difficult to explain. It is possible that those with lower education are more criminal (see page 64). Again one should recall the concerns expressed about actual levels of education included in this study as well as the measure of prior imprisonment vs prior criminal record.

Type of Offense and Code Adherence

As indicated in Chapter IV, type of offense is not examined beyond zero-order cross-tabulations; a relationship between offense type (indictable vs non-indictable) and expressed code adherence is found. Jensen (1974:10) finds that the more serious the offense, the higher the commitment to the code. The present finding supports this.

A discussion of this finding, although supportive of the hypothesis, is included. Jensen uses felons vs misdemeanants as well as violent vs non-violent offense categories. Indictable and non-indictable offense types, used in this study, are not easily compared with Jensen's types; indictable vs non-indictable are not directly comparable to felonies vs misdemeanors. The numbers included in the offense categories for this study also present a problem. While Jensen had 64% of his sample convicted of felonies, 83% of the Canadian inmates are convicted of indictable offenses. Of this 83% convicted of the more serious offenses, 24% are violent (personal and property) offenders. Jensen's violent category includes only murder and assault (28%) whereas only 9% of the inmates included in the present study are convicted of these two offenses. Of the violent offenders (24%) included in this study, offenses are: assault, impaired driving, manslaughter, pointing

a weapon, wounding with intent, rape,[10] possession of a weapon, armed robbery and break and enter.

Although the findings in this study are similar to those reported by Jensen, different categories of offense types are included. And due to the small number included in one category of offense (17% non-indictable), further examination of this variable is deemed inappropriate. Therefore, the finding that type of offense does affect code commitment must be viewed with caution.

A larger number of Canadians convicted of non-indictable offenses is needed before any reasonable comparison with Jensen's data could be made. Also, rather than just the type of offense, future research could consider prior criminal records, whether or not they involved imprisonment. Also to be considered is the relationship between offender types and adherence to the inmate code. Schrag (1961), for example, considers inmates convicted of violent crimes; he classifies prosocial inmates as those "convicted of violent crimes against the person, such as homicide and assault..." (1961:348); antisocial inmates are considered to be those involved in "patterns of unsophisticated crimes, such as robbery, assault and burglary." (1961:348) Asocial inmates "commit a variety of offenses against persons and property." (1961:349) A variety of contact patterns are reported. Prosocial inmates indicate extensive contacts with staff; antisocial offenders have minimal relations with staff; "prosocial offenders may have a wider range of contacts involving both staff and inmates, while the

---

[10] The inmate convicted of rape is also convicted of unlawfully confining a person.

asocial inmates may be restricted to fewer relations in either category." (Schrag, 1961:353). Schrag's typology involves background information on the inmates; their criminal records, prior imprisonments, educational level, family life, etc. Rather than consider inmates' prison behavior in relation to their offense type (violent vs non-violent or indictable vs non-indictable), it may be more appropriate to view inmates as offender types. And because of Canada's sentencing practices for females, this suggestion may be most applicable. (See footnote, page 66.)

CONCLUSION

Of the nine hypotheses considered, three are supported, one is discarded and five are not supported. Two of the three situational hypotheses are supported: a weak relationship exists between institutional career phase and code adherence and no relationship exists between community contact and code adherence. One of the six hypotheses based on imported variables is supported: a negative relationship exists between age and code adherence. The hypothesis that the more serious the offense, the stronger the code commitment, is discarded because of insufficient information and an inadequate population size for one of the categories.

Effects of background characteristics on expressed inmate code adherence are such that this research appears to support to a greater extent the imported rather than the situational explanations of inmate code adherence. The effects of such background variables as age, race and prior imprisonment on code commitment indicate support for the

importation-diffusion model. The finding concerning the relationship between dependence on staff and code adherence, while in opposition to the hypothesis prediction and Jensen's finding, indicates the effect of this situational variable. The relationship between dependence on staff and code adherence is such that some support for the situational or functional-indigenous model is seen. It appears that an interaction between situational and imported models affects the extent of expressed code adherence. Our conclusions appear similar to Jensen's: "both situational and background variables make an independent contribution to inmate perspectives but background variables explain relatively more variance than situational variables." (1975:8)

Although support is indicated for the phase and community contact hypotheses, further examination reveals that the phase-code finding is very weak; this variable is probably inappropriate for the sentence lengths of the population included in this study. The institutional environment provided (physical structure, administrative policies) may also have been inappropriate for measuring institutional career phase as it is related to "pains" of imprisonment. The community contact finding, upon further examination, shows an inadequate measure of this variable. Geographic location as well as other measures of community contact (e.g. weekend passes) might have revealed a significant relationship.

The item measuring residential status, as indicated earlier, does not measure recency of residence. No relationship is found between education and code commitment but the levels and types of education prevent adequate exploration of this relationship. Prior imprisonment, although not expected to affect the extent of code adherence, does

appear to have an effect. Differences between Jensen's sample and this study's population may have resulted in different measures of prior criminal contact - prior prison record is probably an inadequate measure of prior criminal contact. Also, differences in institutions - the actual "pains" of imprisonment presented - may have resulted in different findings. Type of offense as a background variable is not included for analysis beyond the zero-order cross-tabulations because of a number of differences in classification of offenses as well as the small number of inmates the population of this study provided for the less serious offense category.

The negative relationship predicted between age and code adherence is found. As indicated by Jensen, "age, like sex, appears to be one of those general features...of society which has consequences for inmate behavior, reactions to behavior and normative orientation towards the prison and its staff." (1974:11) The negative relationship between race and code adherence is a significant finding. Differences related to race (native and non-native vs blacks and whites), socialization processes (cultural differences) and possibly language, account for the different race-code findings presented here. These two findings--differential commitment to the inmate subculture for natives and younger inmates--should be taken into consideration by the program and policy planners concerned with the incarcerated Canadian female.

Major differences between findings of the present study and those Jensen reports are probably primarily due to differences in sentence lengths (and possibly sentencing practices in general); types of institutions (and possibly the availability of alternate facilities); and cultural differences associated with race and the socialization

process. Jensen, in the revised edition of his study, indicates "divergent findings in previous research may reflect variation in the nature of the inmate populations studied." (1975:11)

As indicated earlier in this thesis, studies on imprisoned females are not as numerous as studies on imprisoned males. Theories of correction are based on male inmate populations. For Canadians the small number of female prisoners may have mitigated against research but as the Royal Commission on the Status of Women (1970) recommends:

> No matter how small the female jail population, adequate treatment programs and services should be organized for women. In fact, the small numbers involved provide an opportunity to try out new methods of correction.

Evidence from this study is such that differences between Canada and the United States for the female inmate populations appear to exist. Therefore, we should not be depending on research based on male inmates and Canadians should not be depending only on data from other countries to use as a base for policy planning.

Jensen suggests in his conclusion that "further research will be necessary to isolate the role of...differential socialization...and variations in the deprivational nature of imprisonment to various groups." (1975:13) The differences in female inmates (Canada vs USA) provide an answer to Jensen's question: "Are differential responses a reflection of personality characteristics, variable norms and expectations concerning reactions to deviance, variable definitions of deprivation or some other aspect of social context?" (1975:16) The major findings presented here indicate the need for more research on imprisoned females: studies which focus on the incarcerated Native offender; and Canadian based research. Cultural, educational, geographical and

sentencing differences are sufficient to warrant separate attention for the Canadian female offender.

SUMMARY OF MAJOR FINDINGS

Hypotheses based on Jensen's study	Finding	Explanation
A weak curvilinear relationship exists between career phase & code adherence.	supported	Emphasis on weak relationship; measuring phase may be inappropriate with short sentences. See pp. 5, 26, 31, 34, 49, 72.
No relationship exists between code adherence and community contact.	supported	All measures of community contact not explored. See pp. 8, 28, 52, 72.
No relationship exists between code adherence and dependence on staff.	not supported	Different measures of dependence on staff used in this study compared to Jensen's measures. See pp. 27, 45, 55.
No relationship exists between race and code adherence.	not supported	Different racial categories: Canada-natives and non-natives; USA-blacks & whites. See pp. 29, 42, 46, 58, 73.
A negative relationship exists between age and code adherence.	supported	This is the "most strongly and persistently related background variable." See pp. 29, 39, 43, 47, 67, 73.
A positive relationship exists between education and code adherence.	not supported	Educational levels not as high as in previous studies; other types of education not examined. See pp. 28, 39, 63.
A positive relationship exists between residence (urban) and code adherence.	not supported	Recency of residence not measured. See pp. 29, 40, 65.
No relationship exists between prior prison record and code adherence.	not supported	Prior prison record measured not prior criminal record. See pp. 29, 40, 66.
The more serious the offense, the stronger the code commitment.	discarded	Insufficient information. See pp. 29, 41, 69.

Suggestions

More research which focuses on imprisoned females.

Studies which focus on native offenders.

Canadian based research.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

ATCHLEY, R.C., and M.P. McCABE. "Socialization in Correctional Communities: A Replication," American Sociological Review 33, (October): 774-785, 1968.

BIRD, F., Chairperson. Report of the Royal Commission on the Status of Women in Canada, Information Canada, Ottawa, 1970.

CHANDLER, E.W. Women in Prison, Bobbs-Merrill Company, Inc., Indianapolis, 1973.

CLEMMER, D. The Prison Community, New York, Rinehart and Company. 1958.

CLOWARD, R.A. "Social Control in the Prison," Theoretical Studies in Social Organization of the Prison, Social Science Research Council Pamphlet No. 15, (March), New York, 1960.

CRESSEY, D., editor. The Prison, Holt, Rinehart and Winston, Inc., New York, 1966.

GARABEDIAN, P.G. "Social Roles and Processes of Socialization in the Prison Community," Social Problems, 1963.

GIALLOMBARDO, R. Society of Women: A Study of a Women's Prison, John Wiley and Sons, Inc., New York, 1966.

GIALLOMBARDO, R. The Social World of Imprisoned Girls, John Wiley and Sons, Inc., New York, 1974.

GLASER, D. The Effectiveness of a Prison and Parole System, Bobbs-Merrill Co., Indianapolis, 1965.

GOFFMAN, E. Asylums: Essays on the Social Situation of Mental Patients and Other Inmates. Anchor Books, Doubleday and Company, Inc., Garden City, New York, 1961.

HAGAN, J. "Extra-Legal Attributes and Criminal Sentencing: An Assessment of a Sociological Viewpoint," Law and Society Review, 8, Spring, pp. 357-383, 1974.

HAZELRIGG, L. Prison Within Society, Anchor Books, Doubleday and Company, Inc., Garden City, New York, 1968.

HEFFERNAN, E. Making It in Prison, John Wiley and Sons, New York, 1972.

HIRSCHI, T., and H.C. SELVIN. Delinquency Research: An Appraisal of Analytic Methods, The Free Press, New York, 1967.

HOOD, R., and R. SPARKS. Key Issues in Criminology, McGraw-Hill Book Company, New York, 1970.

IRWIN, J., and D.R. CRESSEY. "Thieves, Convicts and the Inmate Culture," Social Problems 10 (Fall): 142-155, 1962.

JENSEN, G.F. "Perspectives on Inmate Culture: A Study of Women in Prison," paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Sociological Association, Montreal, 1974.

JENSEN, G.F., and DOROTHY JONES. Revised paper: "Perspectives on Inmate Culture: A Study of Women in Prison," 1975.

JOHNSTON, N., L. SAVITZ, M.E. WOLFGANG, editors. The Sociology of Punishment and Correction, second edition, John Wiley and Sons, Inc., New York, 1970.

MARTINSON, R. "What Works? -- Questions and Answers about Prison Reform," The Public Interest, Number 35, Spring: 22-54, 1974.

McCORKLE, L.W., R. KORN. "Resocialization Within Walls" in The Sociology of Punishment and Correction, Johnston, Savitz and Wolfgang, editors, John Wiley and Sons, Inc., New York, 1970.

MUELLER, J.H., K.F. SCHEUSSLER, H.L. COSTNER. Statistical Reasoning in Sociology, Houghton Mifflin Company, New York, 1970.

ONTARIO PROVINCIAL GOVERNMENT. Ministry of Corrections Research Report No. 1, The Vanier Centre, 1974.

OUIMET, R., Chairperson. Report of the Canadian Committee on Corrections, Queen's Printer, Ottawa, 1969.

SCHRAG, C. "Some Foundations for a Theory of Correction," in The Prison, Cressey, D., editor, Holt, Rinehart and Winston, Inc., New York, 1961.

SCHWARTZ, B. "Pre-Institutional vs Situational Influence in a Correctional Community," Journal of Criminal Law, Crime and Police Science, Volume 62, No. 4, 1971.

SIMON, R.J. The Contemporary Woman and Crime, National Institute of Mental Health, Rockville, Maryland, 1975.

SYKES, G.M. The Society of Captives, Atheneum Press, New York, 1958.

SYKES, G.M., S.L. MESSINGER. "The Inmate Social System," in Theoretical Studies in Social Organization of the Prison, Social Science Research Council Pamphlet No. 15 (March), 1960.

THOMAS, C.W., S.C. FOSTER. "Prisonization in the Inmate Contraculture," Social Problems, 20 (Fall): 229-239, 1972.

TITTLE, C.R., D.P. TITTLE. "Social Organization of Prisoners: An Empirical Test," Social Forces, Volume 43, 1964.

TITTLE, C.R. "Inmate Organization: Sex Differentiation and the Influence of Criminal Subcultures." American Sociological Review 34 (August): 492-504, 1969.

WARD, D.A., G.G. KASSEBAUM. Women's Prison, Sex and Social Structure, Aldine Publishing Company, Chicago, 1965.

WHEELER, S. "Socialization in Correctional Communities," American Sociological Review 26 (October): 607-712. 1961.

WHEELER, S. "Socialization in Correctional Institutions," Handbook of Socialization Theory and Research, D.A. Goslin, editor, Rand McNally and Co., Chicago, 1971.

APPENDIX A

THE QUESTIONNAIRE

SURVEY ON PRISON LIFE

This is part of a study to learn about the experiences, attitudes and opinions of women inmates. I would like you to answer the following questions to the best of your ability and as honestly as possible.

YOUR ANSWERS ARE CONFIDENTIAL: NO MEMBER OF THE DEPARTMENT OF CORRECTIONS WILL SEE THE FORM THAT YOU COMPLETE.

Background Information

1. What is your race? (circle one)

   1. Indian 2. Metis 3. White 4. Other

2. How old are you? (enter on line below)

   ____________ years

3. What is your marital status? (circle one)

1. married	2. divorced
3. separated	4. widowed
5. single	6. common law

4. What is the highest you went in school? (circle one)

   1. no formal schooling
   2. grade school
   3. junior high school
   4. some high school but did not graduate
   5. high school graduate
   6. some schooling beyond high school
   7. completed university with degree
   8. graduate degree

5. In which of the following sorts of places have you lived most of your life? (circle one)

   1. in the country
   2. in a small town (for example Fort McLeod, Drumheller, Edson, Peace River, Pincher Creek)
   3. in a city

6. For what type of offense are you currently serving time? (circle one)

    1. indictable offense

    2. non-indictable offense

7. For what specific offense(s) did you receive your present sentence (for example, property theft, narcotics, public drunkenness, etc.)? List them below.

    ____

    ____

    ____

    ____

    ____

8. How long is your sentence? (enter on line below)

    ______________years ______________months

9. How much of your present sentence have you served? (enter on line below)

    ______________years ______________months

10. How long before you actually expect you'll get out of prison? (enter on line below)

    ______________years ______________months

11. Have you been receiving regular increases in incentive pay? (circle one)

    1. yes 2. no

Your Prison Life and Experiences

12. Not counting your present sentence, about how much time have you spent in prison or juvenile institutions? (circle one)

    1. none
    2. less than 6 months
    3. about one year
    4. about two years
    5. more than two years

13. Since March 1st, 1975, about how many letters have you received from family and friends? (circle one)

    1. at least 1 every week
    2. at least 1 every two weeks
    3. at least 1 every three weeks
    4. at least 1 a month
    5. at least 1 in two months
    6. I have received no letters

14. Since March 1st, 1975, about how many letters have you sent to family and friends? (circle one)

    1. at least 1 every week
    2. at least 1 every second week
    3. at least 1 every third week
    4. at least 1 a month
    5. at least 1 every two months
    6. I have written no letters

15. Since March 1st, 1975, on about how many visiting days have family or friends come to visit you? (circle one)

    1. all of them
    2. most of them
    3. some of them
    4. a few of them
    5. none of them

16. Since March 1st, 1975, how many different persons have come to visit you? (circle one)

    1. none
    2. one
    3. two
    4. three
    5. four or more

17. Think back over the time that you have spent in this institution. How would you say that you spent most of your free time? (circle one)

    1. mostly by myself
    2. with several different inmates, but not in any one group
    3. with just one or two inmates
    4. mostly with a group of inmates who are together a lot

18. Have you developed any strong friendships with other inmates since you have been in the institution? (circle one)

    1. no
    2. yes, 1 or 2
    3. yes, a few (3 to 5)
    4. yes, several (more than 5)

19. Have you developed any strong friendships with any of the staff since you have been in the institution? (circle one)

    1. no

    2. yes, 1 or 2

    3. yes, a few (3 to 5)

    4. yes, several (more than 5)

20. Do you feel that you can depend on other inmates for help and support when you really need it? (circle one)

    1. always

    2. usually

    3. sometimes

    4. not very often

    5. not at all

21. Do you feel that you can depend on friends and relatives outside the prison for help and support when you really need it? (circle one)

    1. always

    2. usually

    3. sometimes

    4. not very often

    5. not at all

22. Do you feel that you can depend on any of the staff in this institution for help and support when you really need it? (circle one)

    1. always

    2. usually

    3. sometimes

    4. not very often

    5. not at all

23. Which of the following do you depend on most for help and support when you really need it? (circle one)

1. other inmates

2. friends and relatives outside the prison

3. staff

Your Attitudes and Opinions about Prison Life

Do you personally agree or disagree with the following statements? (Remember, your answers are confidential, so you should feel free to indicate how you really feel).

24. The matrons here deserve respect because they are only doing their duty. (circle one)

1. strongly agree

2. agree

3. disagree

4. strongly disagree

25. When working on a job an inmate should work as hard as she can even if the other inmates don't. (circle one)

1. strongly agree

2. agree

3. disagree

4. strongly disagree

26. If an inmate knows that another inmate is planning to escape, she should tell a matron. (circle one)

    1. strongly agree

    2. agree

    3. disagree

    4. strongly disagree

27. An inmate should be loyal to other inmates even if it means making things tougher for oneself with the matrons. (circle one)

    1. strongly agree

    2. agree

    3. disagree

    4. strongly disagree

28. Inmates should tell the staff when somebody breaks the rules. (circle one)

    1. strongly agree

    2. agree

    3. disagree

    4. strongly disagree

29. Inmates are called criminals. But so far as this place goes, the matrons are the biggest criminals of all. (circle one)

    1. strongly agree

    2. agree

    3. disagree

    4. strongly disagree

30. The best way to avoid trouble from the other inmates is to keep away from the staff. (circle one)

    1. strongly agree
    2. agree
    3. disagree
    4. strongly disagree

31. Inmates should respect the girl who "gives in" to the staff and does what she's told. (circle one)

    1. strongly agree
    2. agree
    3. disagree
    4. strongly disagree

32. Girls should support the activities that go on around here. (circle one)

    1. strongly agree
    2. agree
    3. disagree
    4. strongly disagree

33. I enjoy taking part in the activities that go on around here. (circle one)

    1. strongly agree
    2. agree
    3. disagree
    4. strongly disagree

34. This prison has something to offer everyone. (circle one)

1. strongly agree
2. agree
3. disagree
4. strongly disagree

Your Activities in Prison

35. Circle all those activities that you've taken part in within the last week.

1. sports or physical activities
2. church
3. school
4. YWCA recreation programs
5. Self-help groups (such as 7 Steps, AA, Native Sisterhood)
6. group counselling
7. Other (please specify)

____

____

36. Have you ever served on the advisory committee? (circle one)

1. yes 2. no

37. How often do you see social work staff (such as psychologists, psychiatrists, social workers, chaplains)? (circle one)

1. several times a week
2. once a week
3. once every two weeks
4. once a month
5. once every few weeks
6. not at all

APPENDIX B

FREQUENCY DISTRIBUTIONS

TABLE 19

RACIAL DISTRIBUTION OF INMATES

	Number	Percentage	Cumulative Percentage
Indian	31	27	27
Metis	13	11	38
White	67	57	96
Other	5	4	100
Unknown	1	1	
Total	117		

TABLE 20

AGE DISTRIBUTION OF INMATES

	Number	Percentage	Cumulative Percentage
19 and under	23	20	20
20 - 24	44	38	58
25 - 29	29	25	83
30 - 34	10	9	92
35 and older	10	9	100
Total	116		

TABLE 21

EDUCATIONAL LEVELS OF INMATES

	Number	Percentage	Cumulative Percentage
No formal schooling	1	1	1
Grade school	4	3	4
Junior high school	40	34	39
Some high school but did not graduate	41	35	74
High school graduate	12	10	85
Some schooling beyond high school	17	15	99
Completed university with degree	1	1	100
Graduate degree	0	0	
Unknown	1	1	
Total	117		

TABLE 22

RESIDENTIAL BACKGROUND OF INMATES

	Number	Percentage	Cumulative Percentage
In the country	17	15	15
In a small town	28	24	40
In the city	68	58	100
Unknown	4	3	
Total	117		

TABLE 23

PRIOR IMPRISONMENT DISTRIBUTION OF INMATES

	Number	Percentage
no prior imprisonment	36	31
less than 6 months	33	28
about 1 year	18	15
about 2 years	5	4
over 2 years	24	21
Total	116	

TABLE 24

INSTITUTIONAL DISTRIBUTION OF INMATES

	Number	Percentage
Oakalla	44	38
Twin Maples	18	15
Fort Saskatchewan	55	47
Total	117	

TABLE 25

SENTENCE LENGTH DISTRIBUTION OF INMATES

	Number	Percentage	Cumulative Percentage
1/2 a month or less	5	4	4
1 month	9	8	12
2 months	8	7	19
3 months	15	13	32
4 months	5	4	36
5 months	0	0	36
6 months	11	9	46
7 months	0	0	46
8 months	0	0	46
9 months	4	3	49
10 months	0	0	49
11 months	1	1	50
12 months	10	9	59
13 months	0	0	59
14 months	0	0	59
15 months	0	0	59
16 months	1	1	60
17 months	0	0	60
18 months	8	7	66
19 months	0	0	66
20 months	3	7	69
21 months	0	0	69
22 months	0	0	69
23 months	0	0	69
24 months	15	13	82
25 months	0	0	82
26 months	0	0	82
27 months	2	2	84
28 months	0	0	84
29 months	0	0	84
30 months	3	3	86
31 months	1	1	87

TABLE 25 (continued)

	Number	Percentage	Cumulative Percentage
32 months	0	0	87
33 months	0	0	87
34 months	0	0	87
35 months	0	0	87
36 months	4	3	91
37 months	0	0	91
38 months	0	0	91
39 months	0	0	91
40 months	0	0	91
41 months	0	0	91
42 months	1	1	92
43 months	0	0	92
44 months	0	0	92
45 months	0	0	92
46 months	0	0	92
47 months	0	0	92
48 months	1	1	93
no sentences until			
60 months	5	4	97
61 months	0	0	97
62 months	0	0	97
63 months	1	1	98
no sentences until			
84 months	1	1	99
no sentences until			
120 months	1	1	100
Total	116		

TABLE 26

EXPRESSED CODE COMMITMENT OF INMATES

	Score	Number	Percentage	Cumulative Percentage
Low	2	1	1	1
adherence	3	1	1	2
	5	1	1	3
	6	4	3	6
	7	11	9	15
	8	22	19	34
	9	16	14	48
High	10	22	19	67
adherence	11	30	26	92
	12	9	8	100

TABLE 27

EDUCATIONAL LEVELS OF NATIVE INMATES

	Number	Percentage	Cumulative Percentage
No formal schooling	1	2	2
Grade school	4	9	12
Junior high school	19	44	56
Some high school but did not graduate	18	42	98
High school graduate	0	0	98
Some schooling beyond high school	1	2	100
Completed university with degree	0	0	100
Graduate degree	0	0	100
Unknown	0	0	100
Total	43		

TABLE 28

SENTENCE LENGTH DISTRIBUTION OF NATIVE INMATES

	Number	Percentage	Cumulative Percentage
1/2 a month or less	3	7	7
1 month	6	14	21
2 months	6	14	35
3 months	4	9	44
4 months	2	5	49
5 months	0	0	49
6 months	3	7	56
7 months	0	0	56
8 months	0	0	56
9 months	2	5	61
10 months	0	0	61
11 months	0	0	61
12 months	3	7	67
no sentences until			
18 months	1	2	67
19 months	0	0	67
20 months	2	5	74
no sentences until			
24 months	6	14	88
no sentences until			
30 months	2	5	93
31 months	1	2	95
no sentences until			
36 months	2	5	100
Total	43		